

THE  
Lutheran  
Quarterly



ne X

MAY, 1958

Number 2

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription \$2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

*Editor*

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

*Managing Editor*

A. J. ENGELBRECHT

1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

*Book Editor*

WARREN A. QUANBECK

2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

*Circulation Manager*

LOWELL J. SATRE

Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

---

## EDITORIAL COUNCIL

---

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
GETTYSBURG, PA.  
LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
PHILADELPHIA, PA.  
AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.  
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
COLUMBUS, OHIO  
WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
DUBUQUE, IOWA  
LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
ST. PAUL, MINN.  
AUGSBURG SEMINARY  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.  
CENTRAL SEMINARY  
FREMONT, NEB.  
CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY  
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA  
WATERLOO, ONT.  
GRANDVIEW SEMINARY  
DES MOINES, IOWA  
HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL  
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO  
LUTHERAN SEMINARY  
SASKATOON, SASK.  
NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.  
SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY  
COLUMBIA, S. C.  
SUOMI SEMINARY  
HANCOCK, MICH.  
TRINITY SEMINARY  
BLAIR, NEB.  
PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY  
BERKELEY, CALIF.

---

## AIMS AND POLICY

- I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.
- II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume X

May, 1958

Number 2

## CONTENTS

|                                                                                  |                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|
| THE MODERN IMAGINATION AND IMAGO DEI .....                                       | <i>Conrad Bergendoff</i>   | 99  |
| THE POSITIVE MEANING OF THE LAW ACCORDING TO PAUL ....                           | <i>E. G. Gulin</i>         | 115 |
| REACHING AS DIRECT ADDRESS .....                                                 | <i>Ernest G. Werner</i>    | 129 |
| THE STATUS OF WOMEN WORKERS IN THE CHURCH ....                                   | <i>Raymond T. Stamm</i>    | 139 |
| LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM                                            |                            |     |
| Ordination of Women in the Church of Sweden? .....                               | <i>Eric H. Wahlstrom</i>   | 161 |
| American Lutheran Converts to Roman Catholicism .....                            | <i>Theodore G. Tappert</i> | 164 |
| PAUL AND OMAR. A Poem .....                                                      | <i>Frances Swarbrick</i>   | 165 |
| CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENT                                                       |                            |     |
| On Faith and Medicine .....                                                      | <i>Otto W. Heick</i>       | 166 |
| Observations on the High Church Movement .....                                   | <i>Carl Beyerhelm</i>      | 168 |
| BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES                                                         |                            |     |
| Lilje, <i>The Last Book of the Bible</i> (W. C. Berkemeyer) .....                |                            | 170 |
| Filson, <i>Which Books Belong to the Bible?</i> (E. E. Flack) .....              |                            | 171 |
| Bowman & Tapp, <i>The Gospel from the Mount</i> (R. T. Stamm) .....              |                            | 172 |
| Arndt, <i>The Gospel According to St. Luke</i> (T. S. Liefeld) .....             |                            | 174 |
| Lampe & Woollcombe, <i>Essays on Typology</i> (E. Mengers) .....                 |                            | 175 |
| Kümmel, <i>Promise and Fulfillment</i> (E. Mengers) .....                        |                            | 176 |
| Gilmour, <i>The Gospel Jesus Preached</i> (R. D. Snyder) .....                   |                            | 177 |
| Elert, <i>The Christian Ethos</i> (H. C. Wolf) .....                             |                            | 178 |
| Wingren, <i>Luther on Vocation</i> (G. Lund) .....                               |                            | 180 |
| Magee, <i>Reality and Prayer</i> (R. M. Olson) .....                             |                            | 181 |
| Wolf, <i>No Cross No Crown: a Study of the Atonement</i> (J. J. Raun) .....      |                            | 182 |
| Kraemer, <i>Religion and the Christian Faith</i> (J. E. Gronli) .....            |                            | 184 |
| Hromadka, <i>Theology Between Yesterday and Tomorrow</i> (J. F. Jansen) .....    |                            | 184 |
| Brunner, <i>Faith, Hope, and Love</i> (J. H. Hanson) .....                       |                            | 185 |
| Maston, <i>Christianity and World Issues</i> (T. I. Jensen) .....                |                            | 185 |
| Lilje et al., <i>Lutheran Churches of the World</i> (G. F. Hall) .....           |                            | 186 |
| Pelikan, ed., <i>Luther's Works, Vol. 22: Sermons on John</i> (S. A. Rand) ..... |                            | 187 |
| Stoudt, <i>Sunrise to Eternity: Jacob Boehme's Life and Thought</i> .....        |                            | 188 |
| Jurji, <i>The Middle East, Its Religion and Culture</i> (K. O. Bjork) .....      |                            | 188 |
| Ferm, <i>Pictorial History of Protestantism</i> (W. D. Allbeck) .....            |                            | 189 |
| Day is Dawning. <i>Story of Bishop Dibelius</i> (L. O. Larson) .....             |                            | 190 |
| Guntrip, <i>Psychotherapy and Religion</i> (G. H. Muedeking) .....               |                            | 190 |
| Tournier, <i>The Meaning of Persons</i> (D. Belgum) .....                        |                            | 191 |
| MacLennan, <i>Resources for Sermon Preparation</i> (L. O. Larson) .....          |                            | 192 |

## CONTRIBUTORS

CONRAD BERGENDOFF is president of Augustana College in Rock Island, Ill.

E. G. GULIN is a bishop in the Church of Finland in Tampere, Finland.

ERNEST G. WERNER is pastor of Grace Church (U.L.C.A.) in Altoona, Pa.

RAYMOND T. STAMM is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pa.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM is professor of the New Testament in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

OTTO W. HEICK is professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Seminary of Canada, Waterloo, Ontario.

CARL BEYERHELM is a missionary of the Augustana Church in Tanganyika Territory, East Africa.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER, pastor of St. Matthew's Church in Bethlehem, Pa.; ELMER E. FLACK, dean of Hamma Divinity School in Springfield, Ohio; THEODORE S. LIEFELD, professor of the New Testament in the Theological Seminary of Capital University in Columbus, Ohio; ETHAN MENGERS, professor of the Old Testament in Trinity Seminary, Blair, Neb.; RUSSELL D. SNYDER, professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa.; HERBERT C. WOLF, professor of Religion in Wittenberg College in Springfield, Ohio; GENE LUND, professor of Religion in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.; RAYMOND M. OLSON, director of the Department of Stewardship, Evangelical Lutheran Church; JAMES J. RAUN, professor of Systematic Theology in Northwestern Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.; JOHN E. GRONLI, professor of Missions in the Lutheran Bible Institute, Minneapolis, Minn.; JOHN F. JANSEN, professor of Religion in Hanover College, Ind.; JAMES H. HANSON, pastor of the American Lutheran Church (E.L.C.) in Hardin, Mont.; THEODORE I. JENSEN, dean of Trinity Seminary in Blair, Neb.; GEORGE F. HALL, pastor of Arlington Hills Church in St. Paul, Minn.; SIDNEY A. RAND, director of the Department of Education, E.L.C.; KENNETH O. BJORK, professor of History in St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minn.

# The Modern Imagination and Imago Dei

BY CONRAD BERGENDOFF

OVER four hundred years ago a scholar of the church wrote these words: "No one, clergyman or layman, has the right, publicly or privately, to express personal opinions about the Catholic faith and to question what once has been established by the holy councils, so that no new heresies may arise or old ones which have been uprooted may again take root and further injure the church. For what has been beneficially decided ought unshakeably to stand forever. It is not every man's right (as Gregory Nazianzus declared) always and everywhere to argue and dispute about God or to try to understand his nature; nor is Holy Writ so simple that it should be available to the ignorant masses and tiny human worms. No, everything is not always to be presented by anyone or for anyone. Only on certain occasions may these matters be brought before designated persons and for specific reasons, and then only by those who have given deep and zealous thought to the speculative sciences and who know how to discern what is bodily and what is non-bodily and spiritual."<sup>1</sup>

The author opposed the Reformation in his homeland and became a refugee. I know of few passages which so clearly sum up a philosophy which was characteristic of medieval Christendom and which the Reformation had to contend with. "What once has been established by the holy councils" was unshakeable, unquestionable. Nor need one go farther for an example of a kind of thought *not* accepted today. Now, in matters of faith at least, anybody can at any time, in any place, and before any audience raise questions and give his own answers. So far is 1957 removed from 1526.

But possibly the religious aspect is not the only one. Has there been, maybe, a revolution in man's thinking so that the attitude toward religion is itself a result of a change which has affected all thought? I would suggest that this is so. A historian of our day has put it this way: "The Aristotelian doctrine of inertia was a doctrine of rest—it

1. Olaus Magnus, *Historia om de Nordiska Folken*, Swedish translation from Latin original of 1526.

was motion, not rest, that always required to be explained," and, "Aristotle, assuming that the state of rest was natural and that bodies tended to return to it where left to themselves had the difficult task of providing an active mover that should operate as long as the body continued to have any movement at all."<sup>2</sup>

We need not here illustrate this *static* nature of Greek thought. It is enough to remind ourselves of the notion of each thing having its place. The position of rest was the ideal place to which everything tended, and the Ptolemaic world of spheres defined the relationship of each moving force to another. Even Copernicus could not shake himself loose from an assumption that "immobility was a nobler thing than movement,"<sup>3</sup> and Roger Bacon "in one place makes it clear that he dislikes the movement of the earth because it would leave nature without any quiet, any immobility."<sup>4</sup>

The medieval notion of a religion fixed by the councils is not unrelated to the underlying belief in a state of rest or immobility which seems to meet a deep demand of human nature. But once it becomes clear that the fundamental fact of life is motion, something happens to the whole "chain of being"<sup>5</sup> in which the links of life had found their place. Randall says of Galileo that he "turned men from the science of perfections, ranks, and purposes to the conception of a universal law in nature"<sup>6</sup> and started the modern investigation and quantitative measurements of nature's forces. "Whirl is king," and men now are seeking the nature of the laws of the kingdom of whirl.

It is not our purpose to pursue the contrast between the concepts of rest or of motion as the nature of the world. This is but an example of the image which becomes determinative in the thinking of a generation, or of centuries. For it is apparent that certain broad assumptions underlie the thought of any time, assumptions which are taken for granted, inherited by one age from another, and often unquestioned for long periods. These presuppositions are less the product of reasoning than they are forms of imagination, the imagery of the mind, the inherited houses in which the mind dwells. That the mind must possess such images I do not dispute. But the thesis of this article is that images

2 Herbert Butterfield, *The Origins of Modern Science* (1950), pp. 3, 14.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 24.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

5 Cf. Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (1948).

6 J. H. Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind* (1940), p. 238.

may become idols, and then thinking is false. Truth is concerned with a proper distinction between them, for idols imply a worship wherein the image has become a god.

## I

One of the dominant images in the mind of our generation has to do with the picture of man himself. It is just a hundred years ago that Charles Darwin sent his famous letter to Asa Gray, the American botanist, explaining his intimations of man's relationship with nature. *The Descent of Man* and *The Origin of Species* have become a part of the modern man's canon, and there is no gainsaying that the past century has completely revolutionized man's thought of himself. We do not quarrel with Darwin's method or his observations as far as they relate to verifiable data. But few people know much about these. What everybody imagines is that it is now established that man is but one of a series of animals that have evolved down through the centuries. In our search for Adam<sup>7</sup> we have discovered bones in various continents that enable us to imagine the connection with extinct or present species. But while the scientist has been at work collecting, comparing, and collating, a popular superstition has been spreading and outracing the finds themselves, inspiring in the minds of all the picture of a human animal who is the product of the forces of nature, and nothing more. It is a superstition that more or less succinctly interprets man's traits as going back to an ancestry whose instincts still shape our frame and our habits.

Evolutionary man as he is popularly understood today is one of the images that has become an idol. For to many this is the ultimate truth, and so this concept takes the place of God in the minds of those who acknowledge no god. They who set up this image of man recognize that there have been other images but consider these overturned by this modern concept. They cannot escape the picture of man as created differently from other animals and standing in a peculiar relationship to the Creator, but this picture is relegated to the storehouse of antiques. They have no explanation for this picture, though on their own theory it should be as natural a development as any other in a process where thoughts as well as bones should find an explanation. It is dismissed as an illusion, though it is hard to explain why this particular animal should

7 Cf. *In Search of Adam*, by Herbert Wendt (1956).

have illusions that the rest of nature does not possess. To the doubting the faith that is put in an ancient bone seems a small foundation on which to build the superstructure of a philosophy of humanity, and one wonders at the possibility of illusion in the disciples of the new religion of man. But my purpose here is not to argue the case. I am seeking only to establish that a new religion is upon us which knows of no unique relationship of man to a God, but only of struggle with one's environment, where one natural phenomenon is as amoral as another and any code of right or wrong is a conventional arrangement of those using it.

I repeat that I am not quarreling with any data of biology or physiology or anatomy. I am disputing the right of either the educated or the uneducated to interpret these data so as to make of man a whim of unreasoning powers of nature, with no unique beginning or end, and of intervening life as a tragic and meaningless fantasy.<sup>8</sup> Whoever wishes so to believe can of course do so. But he does so with no more sanction of science or human intelligence than the man who believes in an image of man he chooses to connect with the image of God. The Christian considers the picture of man which emerges from an irreligious use of the theory of evolution as superstition and idolatry, the kind of idolatry described by Paul, centuries ago, which has "changed the truth of God into a lie and worshiped and served the creatures more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen" (Rom. 1:25).

## II

A distinguishing aspect of the past century has been the interplay of the evolutionary theory of man and the revolutionary idea of society. Comparable to the influence of Darwin in shaping the imagination of our age in regard to the nature of the human body is the influence of Marx in changing man's ideas of the nature of human society. His *Communist Manifesto* came out in 1848, his magnum opus, *Das Kapital*, in 1867. It is possible that either Darwin's or Marx's writings might have had immeasurable consequences, but it is amply proved by history how the two have reinforced each other in making the modern mind.

To a world still thinking in terms borrowed from feudalism, Marx appeared to his disciples as a prophet of a new order of society. It was a world retaining vestiges of a system wherein each individual had a

8 Cf. Bertrand Russell, *A Free Man's Worship*.

place, and each function of society was represented by a group fitted for its function. The old image of orders, or estates, was a curious blend of religious and feudal ideas, and on it parliaments had been organized and social life constructed. The house-father was head of the domestic estate, the clergy were a "holy order," the king and army were the governing class. The imagery comprehended everybody and all phases of life in a kind of static scheme not unlike that in which the planets moved in the Ptolemaic picture of the universe. But new forces pressed on the sides of the containing ideas and gradually shattered the whole. Marx saw in the transition nothing but a new mode of exploiting the laborer. "The essential difference between the various forms of society," he wrote in *Das Kapital*, "between, for instance, a society based on slave labour and one based on wage labour, lies only in the mode in which this surplus labour is in each case extracted from the actual producer, the labourer."<sup>9</sup> "Manufacture is but a particular method of begetting relative surplus-value, or of augmenting at the expense of the labourer the self-expansion of capital. . . . It is a refined and civilized method of exploitation."<sup>10</sup> "The simultaneous employment of a large number of wage-labourers in one and the same process . . . forms the starting point of capitalist production. The point coincides with the birth of capital itself."<sup>11</sup> "The character of independence and estrangement which the capitalist mode of production as a whole gives to the instruments of labour and to the product, as against the workman, is developed by means of machinery into a thorough antagonism. Therefore, it is with the advent of machinery that the workman for the first time brutally revolts against the instruments of labour."<sup>12</sup>

In sentences such as these we find the genesis of the theory that capitalism has only taken the place of other masters of labor and that the time has come for the laborer to take into his own hands the control of the means of production. This involves a class struggle, and the laboring class must seize the power of the political government in order to acquire a dictatorship of the proletariat. In capitalism, Marx held, "we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers." In socialism "we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the

9 Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Edited by F. Engels, revised and amplified (Modern Library), p. 339.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 400.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 367.

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 471-472.

people.”<sup>13</sup> Once the proletariat has gotten control of all the means of production, the state, “to use Engels’ phrase, ‘withers away,’ i.e., its repressive functions disappear and its administrative functions become part and parcel of the productive process of a society in which ‘the free development of all is the condition for the free development of each.’”<sup>14</sup>

Marx advocated revolution as the means of effecting the “classless” society, and our own day has seen his theories put to a world-wide test. Marxism is another example of an image of change converted into idolatry, for it has become the religion of communism and the idols now worshiped by millions include the proletarian dictatorship, the class-struggle, the abolition of capitalism, the totalitarian state.

Taking from Christianity (which he rejected along with all religion as an opiate) such concepts as justice, equality, and universality, Marx turned the kingdom of heaven into an earthly economic order, the law of God into a dialectical materialism, the divine atonement into a revolution of the masses, the church into a class-less society of social distribution. Long before Marx, of course, there were both individuals and societies that saw no meaning in human existence except in economic or political power. In all ages there have been those to whom life consists in an abundance of possessions. But Marx went beyond any individual’s worship of Mammon to construct a philosophy of history and a theory of political science on the assumption that all culture and civilization have been determined by the struggle for means of production, that the control of the state has been in capitalist hands but will now be taken over by the laboring class, and that economic oppression will disappear with the victory of socialism. Beyond this prospect there is nothing for man.

We have not yet realized how earth-shaking this new idolatry is. It is not only a change of governments or laws that is involved, but a sweeping away of all the standards we have been accustomed to obey. We are dealing with a way of thought and life based entirely on naked power. It is not only God that is denied, but the foundations on which all Christian society has been built. A contemporary historian remarks that “the Versailles settlement was destroyed not by events or causes in the field of international relations proper, but by the advent of the European revolution. In Russia, and then in Italy and Germany, regimes

13 *Ibid.*, p. 837.

14 Sidney Hook, *Toward the Understanding of Karl Marx*, p. 139.

came into power which did not simply demand a revision of the existing structure, but repudiated it altogether. . . . They recognized no law and no limitations. . . . States which repudiated all law in favor of mere will could not form part of any international order.’”<sup>15</sup>

### III

As if it were not enough that a revolution overturned man's ancient ideas and images of his own bodily structure and another sought to do away with all his standards of social structure and political purpose, our age has created new and strange images of the mental life and activity of human beings. The third creator of the modern imagination, Sigmund Freud, has changed man's thinking about his own mind and the way it functions. Lionel Trilling has claimed that “the Freudian psychology is the only systematic account of the human mind which, in point of subtlety and complexity, of interest and tragic power, deserves to stand beside the chaotic mass of psychological insights which literature has accumulated through the centuries.”<sup>16</sup> Freud's name is connected with the unconscious, though he disclaimed its discovery. “The poets and philosophers before me discovered the unconscious,” he said. “What I discovered was the scientific method by which the unconscious can be studied.”

Yet in the popular mind of our day a new dimension of thought has been opened up by Freud's interpretation of the unconscious, and a new meaning has been given to the nature of human thought. Not only has mental activity been extended to include a whole realm of sub-conscious experience, but the temptation, at least, has been present to consider the real issues to be in this realm. What the conscious mind discerns and decides has been traced back to impulses and motives which operate in the “underground” of the mind. If we would know what really makes the mind what it is we must look into the depths beneath, where memories and desires and fears are stored from long ago. There what the ego has suppressed for one or another reason finds ways of associating with other impulses and desires and finds expression in some way, either unbeknown or in a guise that gains entrance to the conscious world.

Freud's “chief claim to fame,” says his biographer Ernest Jones,

15 Max Beloff, in *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1951, pp. 248-262.

16 *The Liberal Imagination* (Doubleday, Anchor Books), p. 44.

rests on his establishment of "the primary system and the 'secondary system' of mental functioning." "In the primary system," Jones explains, "such as operates in the young infant, in dreams and to a large extent in making phantasies, the pleasure principle dominates the scene. No mental process has any other purpose than to elicit pleasure and avoid unpleasure. It is its failure to procure adequate satisfaction that compels the further step of taking reality into account. Now it is no longer what is pleasurable that counts but also what is real. This is the transition from the earlier principle to the later one, a transition that is never fully completed."<sup>17</sup>

In the struggle between the "pleasure principle" and the "reality principle" the history of the individual mind is written, and it includes not only the selected conscious thoughts that appear on the mental stage but all the dreams and fantasies of the never-sleeping mind. Freud thought he had found the sexual instinct as basic to all this history, but in his thinking sexual was a wider term than we make it. Indeed, it was almost a phase of the other fundamental principle dominating human thought, namely, the instinct of self-preservation. But whatever content Freud gave the word, in the language of much of our contemporary life the word "sex" has come to mean a particular relationship of the sexes, and as never before, literature, art, drama have given themselves to prove the mysterious secrets of that relationship. Whatever the purpose of psychoanalysis may be, it can hardly be denied that in the imagination of the multitudes the political or economic interpretation of life has given way to a biological one. In the light of the influence of Darwin's work, Freud's has come as a sort of supplement. Together they have made it possible for a sort of interpretation to gain credence which explains the life of man as a result of hidden, biological forces. These forces find natural expression until civilization makes their control and partial suppression necessary. The reality which the mind encounters may be largely of its own making, and exists only as long as it can enforce control over the "primary" principle. Man may find it advisable to reconstruct a society where these elemental urges have freer play. But no higher, metaphysical reality deters him from changing the stage scenery of human habits whenever he so decides. The world of dreams and the world of conscious ideas and ideals may be two different hemispheres, but they are all one world—and the only world that is.

17 Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud* (1955), Vol. II, p. 313.

## IV

The thought world of any generation is too complex for any neat formula. But if I understand at all the kind of imagination which is characteristic of our so-called modern world, it is one which bears indelible marks of the three types of thinking I have sketched above. It may be fanciful to make the suggestion but I am tempted to contrast this modern trinity with the world of faith inspired by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Not that there is any similarity of source, but the modern articles of faith are in contrast to the ancient doctrines of creation, redemption, and sanctification. Over against the Christian faith in a God who is Creator of all that exists and the ground of human personality emerges the contemporary faith in an impersonal energy setting all things in motion but finding no deeper truth than an accidental collocation of atoms as the explanation of both universe and man. Down through the countless ages the changes have followed one another and the result is a series of beings all fundamentally one but evolving for certain periods into specific structures. To the second article of the Christian faith Marxism has opposed a different kind of sins, a different mode of redemption, and a different kind of society. Man is an economic animal who has become enslaved to a master class exercising power over the worker by the control of means of production. Communism comes to save the toiling masses by liquidating the enemy (the capitalist class) and by setting up a kingdom of humanity where the proletariat rules and paradise is achieved when each produces according to his capacity and each receives according to his need. And instead of an article on the Holy Spirit the "modern trinitarian" expresses his faith in a spirit of the Super-ego which reconciles the Id, removes sin by analysis, and adjusts man to a temporal existence where childish happiness may endure through life.

This is not meant as a parody, except as the worship of idols is always a parody on the worship of the true God. It can hardly be otherwise, for Christianity is concerned with the fundamental realities of human existence. It gives answers to ultimate questions. Those who do not accept the Christian faith cannot get away from the questions with which Christian thought deals. They can only give other answers. Sometimes they can only say that they do not believe the Christian answers; they have none of their own. Neither can they get away from the in-

stinctive need of man to worship, to put himself into the obedience of whatever he deems the supreme truth.

It is my view that we live in an age of idolatry, where the gods who are popularly worshiped are, not Jupiter, or Mars, or Venus, but modern ideas as to man's creation, redemption, and sanctification. Darwinism has led, willingly or unwillingly, to a vague notion that man is created by amoral, impersonal, ultimately insignificant forms of energy. Marxism has substituted an economic materialism for the kingdom of God. Freudianism has converted the human tragedy into a conflict of natural impulses, mostly reducible to sexual drives.

And the parallel of trinitarianism is born out in the relationship of the persons of this trinity to each other. The dependence of Marxism on Darwinism is seldom observed, but it is demonstrable that the idea of progress which had grown up in previous centuries was engrafted on the idea of evolution, so that men came to believe that the process of nature was in the direction of improvement and perfection. It was easy to apply this notion to social and political fields. Marxism is a sort of social Darwinism: it is in the nature of history itself to develop the dialectic of materialism, and Communism awaits the unfolding of history. As the body of man has developed by forces in nature, so the forms of society follow a natural law. In either case it is a fatalistic view, for man has little control over these forces. But the important point for our discussion is the interdependence of Marxism on Darwinism. We are told that Marx had thoughts of dedicating *Das Kapital* to Darwin.<sup>18</sup> There have been plenty of people of our generation who have felt that the development of history has forced them, even as intellectuals, into the Marxist camp, for they are but following the evolutionary forces that control us.

Freud, too, was conscious of his relationship to Darwin. To a correspondent he wrote, "You are right in saying that the enumeration in my last paper may give the impression of claiming a place beside Copernicus and Darwin." Jones, who reports this, elaborates that "the demonstration of man's essential affinity with other animals, and his descent from them . . . had been generally made only in respect of man's body, not his mind; it was Freud's work that is gradually extending it to the latter. . . . Consciousness is far from knowing about everything

18 Edward Heimann, *Vernunftglaube und Religion in der Modernen Gesellschaft* (Tübingen, 1955), p. 88, note 1.

at goes on in the mind, even about most important aspects of it, and man's power of controlling either his thoughts or his impulses is much less than he had deceived himself into believing."<sup>19</sup>

In Freud's thought "every one of us represents a fragment of life energy."<sup>20</sup> And on that theory one can construct a mechanical personality. But Freud invaded every aspect of humanity with his formula and grafted Darwin's ideas onto his rack. I quote again from Jones, "Then comes the nice question of the historical origin of these great primordial institutions from which all later religions seem to have derived through elaboration and modification. Here Freud was supported by a suggestion of Darwin's that early mankind must have resembled the higher apes in living in small hordes consisting of one powerful male and several females; Freud's special contribution at this point was to assume that periodically the growing sons banded together, slew and devoured the father."<sup>21</sup> So the Oedipus complex goes much farther back than to the Greeks! At only one point do I find that Freud's biographer and disciple felt that his master went beyond the facts. "Basing himself on what we know of the very great importance of the sense of smell in the sexual life of animals, Freud suggested that the extensive deterioration of this sense in man, resulting from his adoption of the upright posture, must play a great part in predisposing human beings to neurotic disorders and, put more generally, in explaining why civilization singles out the sexual instinct for repression"<sup>22</sup> (Does this mean that if man had been a quadruped we would have had an easier time of it?). Jones does feel obliged to remark, "He certainly went beyond what we actually know."

In such a contemporary pantheon there is no room for a God revealed in Jesus Christ, a divine purpose in creation, a law absolute in its requirement of human responsibility, a sense of guilt or an experience of the forgiveness of sins, devotion to a divine lordship, or eternal significance of the individual soul. No wonder that these articles of faith are meaningless to a generation brought up in the atmosphere of idolatry. Many a youth highly educated in our time joins the Athenians heckling Paul and being amused by his proclamation of Christ amid

19 *Op. cit.*, pp. 225-226.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 417.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 359.

22 *Op. cit.*, p. 267.

the altars to their unknown gods. Always prepared to hear something new, our own curiosity seekers are willing to give audience to one more way to the unknown. But they are not aware of their own idolatry, of their subscription to a kind of thinking which demands more credulity of them than the Christian message demands of faith from those who heed it. For the supposition that modern idolatry is based on science—biological, economic, or psychological—is itself a delusion. That which has conviction of truth with it in modern biology, economics, or psychology is not inconsistent with the Christian faith. The medieval monk who thought all truth was fixed was mistaken. He confused the alterable and the unalterable. Forms of thinking may change. Problems may be differently stated. But there are truths which persist from age to age, making knowledge itself possible. There are new discoveries which light up the human situation, but the purpose of human life remains. Churchmen have made mistakes in their explanations, but unless there be some unchanging truths no explanation would ever mean much, right or wrong. Man may worship idols that mislead him as to the character of his being. But he may also worship the truth and find images of that truth which enable him to follow the divine guidance and to find the rightful destiny for which he was created.

Let us note briefly the truth that is perverted in today's idolatry and see its bearing on the faith we continue to profess.

## V

What men have learned through the discoveries of science can be considered as establishing even more firmly the faith in a God whose power is beyond all human comprehension. There is nothing inconsistent with that faith in seeing the creative power of an eternal God stretching out over the millions of years that man's arithmetic seems to crave as we trace the process whereby heavens and earth and all that is therein came to be. Genesis is not meant to explain but to cause to adore. And even the words of the seventh day must be understood in the light of Jesus' word, "My Father is working still, and I am working" (John 5:17). The continuance of the cosmic world is as hard to understand as its creation. And there is no difference between the mystery of how things came to be and how they still subsist at this moment. Can one read such a sentence as this from a contemporary scientist without in-

crease of awe and wonder before the cause of it all? R. A. Millikan writes:

What a fascinating picture of the ultimate structure of matter has been presented by this voyage to the land of the infinitely small! Only two ultimate entities have we been able to see there, namely, positive and negative electrons; alike in the magnitude of their charge but apparently differing much in mass; the positive being eighteen hundred and thirty-five times heavier than the negative; both being so vanishingly small that hundreds of them can somehow get inside a volume which is still a pinpoint after all dimensions have been swelled ten billion times; the ninety-two different elements of the world determined simply by the difference between the number of positives and negatives which have been somehow packed into the nucleus; all these elements transmutable, ideally at least, into one another by a simple change in this difference. Has nature a way of making these transmutations in her laboratories? She is doing it under our eyes in the radioactive process. Does the process go on in both directions, heavier atoms being continually formed as well as continually disintegrating into lighter ones? Not on earth as far as we can see. Perhaps in the depths of space or in the stars. Some day we may find out.<sup>23</sup>

Science, if anything, can lead us to a deeper awe before the fact of God's creation.

Science thinks in forms of images. But they must not become idols. And the ancient prophet told us long ago that the images of nature's wonders have a religious meaning. Isaiah pointed to the infinity of the star-studded skies, not in order to have his people stop in breathless wonder, but to behold therein a pledge; the God who made these could be depended on to sustain the meaning of humanity.

For thus says the Lord,  
Who created the heavens  
(he is God!),  
who formed the earth and made it  
(he established it;  
he did not create it a chaos,  
he formed it to be inhabited):  
I am the Lord, and there is no other.  
I did not speak in secret,  
in a land of darkness;  
I did not say to the offspring of Jacob,  
"Seek me in chaos."  
I the Lord speak the truth,  
I declare what is right (Is. 45:18-19).

The Bible is the story of the meaning of man. Created in the image of God, he reflects the purpose of God in this mysterious universe. His is the story of a member of a people through whom that purpose is

23 *Electrons, Protons, Photons, Neutrons, and Cosmic Rays*, p. 208.

worked out. So strange is the story, so unpredictable its fortunes, that we may well grant that no human mind could conceive it, or comprehend it. Not because the career of God's people is contrary to reason do we say that it is beyond reason, but because man cannot comprehend (but must take on faith) this working out of an eternal will of the Creator. We cannot here review it. We but join in Paul's rapturous words as he contemplates how God chose and won for himself a people to testify of his grace, but also thereby of man's significance. The words are those in Romans 11, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways!" Then repeating lines from Isaiah he goes on. "For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be glory forever. Amen."

That the Christian faith is a faith we gladly acknowledge. But it is no whim created by human fancy. It has grown out of the facts of creation itself and out of the experiences and sufferings of centuries of human history. It is no day-dream of human wishful thinking but the outline of the significance of all that humanity has experienced. When men speak glibly of different pathways to God, and of Christ as one of many who have offered guidance to mankind, they show a profound ignorance of how faith in Christ came to be, and how unique is the story of a people prepared for his coming and of a people created by his coming. This image of God was no beautiful product of human imagination.

He had no form or comeliness that we should look at him,  
and no beauty that we should desire him.  
He was despised and rejected by men;  
a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;  
And as one from whom men hide their faces  
he was despised, and we esteemed him not (Is. 53:2, 3).

The people who saw his Light have formed a new commonwealth. His kingdom is one of peace and justice, and however imperfect its realization hitherto, there is not much of virtue and integrity in the world that has not in some way stood in connection with that kingdom. Whatever dreams of a better world Marx had, he borrowed its glory from the kingdom revealed in Scripture. But in rejecting the Lord and nature of the kingdom Marx destroyed all chance of gaining its possessions. The bloody course of Communism through the past century is the price paid for an idolatry before the image of Mammon. "Man

does not live by bread alone," was Christ's reply to the Tempter who had better success with Marx and his followers. We shall yet learn, probably only through suffering, that there is a connection between the righteousness of the kingdom of God and the problems of what we shall eat and drink and wear. Marx substituted one tyranny for another. The Christian church must give proof of its faith in the kingdom of God by something more than opposition to Communism. It must bring forth the fruits of repentance and do the Lord's will, not only repeat his name. But let us remember that only in the Christian teaching is there a place for repentance and for personal responsibility in social life. It is a story of a people, not a description of a herd.

If Marxian idolatry should make us more keenly sensitive to the nature of the kingdom, the Freudian can emphasize the power of the evil which only the power of one greater than man can overcome. For that much of human imagination is associated with drives of self and sex is no discovery of our century. I know of few passages of Scripture more relevant to our own day than the latter part of the first chapter of Romans. Here, too, is a question of suppression, but not in the Freudian sense. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth." Here, too, is a reference to the meaning of the created universe. "Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made." But men "became futile in their thinking, and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or bird or animal or reptiles." What happens when the idols of reptiles or birds hover in man's imagination as the source of his origin, and men "exchange the truth about God for a lie" and worship and serve "the creature rather than the Creator"? According to Paul, "God gave them up to dishonorable passions. Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in their own persons the due penalty for their error."

Christ needed not to be told by Freud what was in man's hidden thoughts, "for he knew what was in man" (John 2:25). But if Freud had known what was in the mind of Christ, he would have learned that

man's destiny was something more than the satisfaction either of the instinct of sex or of self-preservation. He would have understood the words of Christ, "Every one who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart," and also the following words, "It is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be thrown into hell" (Matt. 5:28, 29). For until the glory of the image of God in Christ has appeared to a mind, there is no power able to cleanse the heart from human passion. Freud knew nothing of religion, else he might have seen in the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin the entrance into the heart of one stronger, who binds and deprives of power the demons who previously had taken possession of the soul.

There is much said in our day of myth and demythologizing. We are bidden to separate gospel and myth in the New Testament, as if our own age did not have its own mythology into which the modern mind would fit the Gospel. We need to remember that it was from idolatry and mythology that the prophets of the Old Testament and the Messiah of the New would save us. The myths have changed. A new imagination has occupied the minds of men. We need not so much a demythologizing of the Bible as a separation of fact and fancy in modern biology, economics, and psychology. The facts that have been discovered in these sciences have been woven into myths of man's relationship to the rest of creation, myths of his nature and the laws of society. The vulgar devotees have reared altars to these idols at which the passions of men are whipped into frenzy and self-annihilation. The more intellectual idolatry creates a pantheon of new names of the ultimate forces, with agnosticism reserving altars for unknown gods. The ancient charge that men create their gods finds fresh evidence in the contemporary world. But yet the revelation of a God men neither could nor would imagine stands as the highest and purest of the knowledge of God. A God revealed to man on Golgatha is yet mankind's only key to the understanding of the nature of man as well as the nature of God. The image of the Suffering Servant who wins men to himself and to the realm of society where a righteous and pure God rules is alone worthy of man's true nature and destiny. To have beheld his glory, as he dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, is to have found the image of man which saves us from all temptations to idolize the created instead of the Creator. Because we are created in his image we must behold that image in order to live.

# The Positive Meaning of the Law According to Paul

BY E. G. GULIN

MANY readers of Anders Nygren's magnificent interpretation of the Epistle to the Romans have drawn the conclusion that since law in the teaching of St. Paul is equated with sin, the wrath of God, and death, Christians consequently have nothing more to do with it. This of course is a fatal misconception, as will be seen in what follows.

By his doctrine of justification by faith St. Paul shook to its very foundations the conception of the law held by the synagogue and by judaizing Christians. It is clear that in this way he drew the ultimate conclusions from the Gospel of Jesus. In the apostle's message Christ and the way of salvation by law appeared as irreconcilable opposites. On the basis of his new relationship with God, Paul, as is well known, used the severest expressions of condemnation when he spoke of the law. The law "arouses our sinful passions," for "the law is the power of sin." By his own experience he knows both of the "curse of the law" and of its "yoke of slavery" (Rom. 7:5; I Cor. 15:56; Gal. 3:10, 13, 5:1).

And yet, the law has even for him an indispensable importance. He emphasizes that precisely by his unlegalistic Gospel the law comes to its full rights. "Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law" (Rom. 3:31).

Our question is: In what sense can Paul "uphold the law"? Is he able to do it without thereby coming into conflict with his own basic intentions? Or does he, without being aware of it, set forth totally contradictory propositions?

## I

In his decisive battle against the Judaizers St. Paul always radically emphasized complete freedom from the law. According to him there was a choice to be made between Christ and the law. Against the "both—and" principle of the opposing party he drew up his "either—or" program. If Christian believers yielded themselves to the lures of the

Judaizers to adhere to the law, they "turned back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits" under whose bondage they had lived when they were still heathen (Gal. 4:9; cf. 4:3). *The new age has dawned*. Now a definite stand has to be taken: either to remain with Christ or to live outside the sphere of his life, where the demonic forces hold sway. "Christ is the end of the law" (Rom. 10:4). A totally new way of salvation has been opened. The meaning of law as the basis of the relationship with God has become obsolete.

This main theme appears in ever new variations. So it is, for instance, in a central but, in a certain respect, obscure passage where, with an illustration taken from married life and the death of the husband, St. Paul tries to explain how the new age also has brought with it freedom from the law (Rom. 7:1 ff.). A certain obscurity arises from the fact that on one hand Paul lets Christ die, comparing him with the husband, but on the other hand speaks of the death of Christians from the law. The difficulty, however, is solved by the concept of the two ages. As Christ before his death lived "under the law," so also should his disciples be subject to the law. Subsequently Jesus died in order to become Christ the Lord (Rom. 1:4). Therefore the disciples also became free from their former "marital bonds," to marry a new husband, the risen Christ free from the law. This could not have happened unless they, too, had "died." "Because we are convinced that one has died for all, therefore all have died. And he died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised" (II Cor. 5:14 f.). Without this "death," i.e., transition from the old age to the new one, the believers would have had no possibility of attaining "the new life of the Spirit" (Rom. 7:6) and of bringing forth fruit for Christ. "If any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come" (II Cor. 5:17).

A new example of this fact is given in Gal. 4. The Judaizers are the children of Hagar, the slave; they are ruled by the spirit of bondage. The Pauline Christians, on the contrary, are born according to the Spirit, the power of the new age. Like Isaac, they are the sons of Sarah, the free woman. They are ruled by the free spirit of adoption. They are the sons of the new Jerusalem, which is above and is free (Gal. 4:26; Rom. 8:15). In other words, they are the free children of the coming age. Thus the late-Jewish and primitive-Christian idea of the

two ages forms the very foundation for the Pauline freedom from the law.

The same idea of the two ages also sheds light upon the question concerning the positive meaning of law for Paul. On the one hand, the law is in principle annulled, but on the other hand, the apostle seems to rest upon its foundation. This paradoxical situation we must now examine more closely.

## II

When Paul speaks of the "law," he by no means always thinks of the Ten Commandments or the books of Moses alone, but he often applies the word in a late-Jewish manner to the whole Old Testament (e.g., Rom. 3:19; I Cor. 14:21). He is convinced that his Gospel fulfills the law in this broader meaning.

The church of Christ consists of the people of the last age. It is the "Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16), which has inherited from Israel its Holy Scriptures, particularly the Old Testament. Only the Christian church understands the Scriptures rightly. The Jews lack even the possibility of doing this, because "wherever Moses is read a veil lies over their minds" (II Cor. 3:15). They maintain that the old age still exists unbroken and they lack the gift of the new age, the Spirit, who alone is able to interpret the Scriptures properly. Therefore, they are also unable to grasp the real meaning of the law. They cling only to the letter of the law, whereas the law is "spiritual" (Rom. 7:14). For this reason the law should now be interpreted spiritually since the age of Spirit has already begun. Only thus can the innermost meaning of the law be disclosed.

This is illustrated in a concrete way in Paul's interpretation of the commandment of circumcision. In the late-Jewish period, particularly, this commandment had become a central expression for the will of God. But the synagogue understood the commandment literally. Thus, according to Paul, it has been led into false paths. Christians, on the contrary, should find in the commandment a "spiritual" truth pointing to something much deeper than the external and literal observance of the commandment. With an unyielding consistency Paul writes in the light of his total view of the will of God: Every man who as a Christian, according to the letter of the law, still "receives circumcision . . . is bound to keep the whole law" with all its washings, rites of purification, ordinances concerning food, etc., which leads to the curse of the law

and at the same time "severs from Christ" (Gal. 5:3 f.). If the way of law is chosen in its literal meaning, the law must be fulfilled according to its every letter. This, however, is impossible (Gal. 3:10; Rom. 3:20). Paul has, so to say, gone to the school of Jesus. Like Jesus, Paul condemns the Jewish casuistic interpretation of the law according to which, for instance, the offering-commandment could be set over against the fourth commandment (Mark 7:9 ff.). Against the literal interpretation of the Judaizers, Paul sets forth his spiritual interpretation: true circumcision is "a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal," and "we are the true circumcision, who worship God by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 2:29; Phil. 3:3). Thereby Paul is able to refer to the law in its broader meaning: in the Old Testament (= in the law) Jeremiah understood the circumcision in this way (Jer. 4:4), and according to this interpretation Christians fulfilled the commandments of the law. Paul "upholds the law."

This is true also of many other commandments of the law. The Judaizers, like the Jews, clung to the external, literal meaning when, for instance, on Easter they purged out the old leaven from their houses. Viewed in the light of Christ this Easter custom acquires the new meaning of purging out the moral old leaven from the lives of men. In the same manner the Jewish unleavened bread points to the fact that the believers themselves should be "unleavened" because their "paschal lamb," Christ, has already been sacrificed (I Cor. 5:6 ff.). The Old Testament should be interpreted according to the Spirit.

If we compare these opposite ways of interpreting the law, we get the best commentary on Paul's statement of principle, "the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life" (II Cor. 3:6). Only Christ, who comes with the new age of the Spirit, is able to take away the veil, so that the real meaning of the law becomes clear for the reader (II Cor. 3:16).

In the same manner Paul explains the past history of Israel in the light of the fulfillment. The crossing of the Red Sea referred to Christian baptism, the manna was an Old Testament type of the Holy Communion, the rock in the wilderness that gave water pointed to Christ, Hagar and Sarah represented two covenants, etc. (I Cor. 10:1 ff., Gal. 4:21 ff.). It seems that Paul himself has shown us the way to this eschatological "spiritual" understanding of the law when he refers to the narratives in the law of the Old Testament and states that they have a "typical" meaning for us "upon whom the end of the ages has come"

(I Cor. 10:11). Formally speaking, he was only adopting the rabbinical method of allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures—particularly the Alexandrian Jews were known as masters of this art—but as far as the contents are concerned, Paul was always bound by the purpose of the Gospel.

### III

So far everything is clear. Out of the spirit-filled richness of the new age the law is interpreted "spiritually." Thus it acquires a new depth. But it is obvious that the Judaizers never could accept this free interpretation of the law which in their opinion endangered everything. According to them he spoke "against this holy place and the law" and "will change the customs which Moses delivered to us" (Acts 6:13 f.). The apostle's spiritual interpretation of the law seemed to them too vague a basis on which to build a strong moral life. Were not the Pauline congregations clear proofs of this fact? Morals wavered. The watchword, "All things are lawful for me," took possession of people. The gravest sins flourished even among the believers. By his righteousness of faith Paul made the law null and void!

It is the most remarkable feature in the Pauline letters that he does not in the slightest degree yield to these law-enthusiasts while, at the same time, he clings steadfastly to the requirement of the law for a holy life. This apparent duality is now to be considered. We shall prove that, in this point also, the idea of the two ages solves the problem.

Without yielding at all, Paul first considers our indispensable freedom. He does not disdain the watchword of the former heathen, "All things are lawful for me." This he appropriates to himself although he adds the following qualification: "but not all things are helpful"—for my neighbor (I Cor. 6:12). He never acknowledges that the law as a commandment is necessary in the life of the believer to produce a holy life (third use of the law). When in Rom. 6:1 ff. he answers the question where the believer finds the norm for his Christian life if the law is not taken into consideration, he does not refer to the Old Testament with a single word but points only to Christ, to a dying and a rising again with him. Fellowship with Christ guarantees a holy life. This reserve in regard to citing the Old Testament is all the more significant as an external norm of the law would have facilitated considerably his difficult task of ethical instruction among the heathen.

The requirement of the law for a holy life, nevertheless, may under no circumstances be neglected! Paul wishes to "uphold the law" not only in its broader significance (= the Old Testament) but also in its proper, narrower meaning. As an expression of the will of God it stands in the center of the apostle's teaching. Thus he can say that God has brought forth the new age through Jesus' death and resurrection "in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the spirit" (Rom. 8:4).

Christ's work of salvation not only atoned for the sins of mankind, not only brought forth the new age of grace and righteousness, but at the same time it took into consideration that the requirement of the law would now become a holy reality in the men of the new age (cf. "the man who is uncircumcised keeps the precepts of the law," Rom. 2:26). That which during the old age could never become possible, because it took only human possibilities into consideration, becomes a reality in the new age which provides man with a new power, the Spirit. When the apostle now compares Israel and the church of Christ in this light, he finds that the roles have been changed. "That Israel who pursued the righteousness which is based on law did not succeed in fulfilling that law," whereas those "who did not pursue righteousness have attained it" (Rom. 9:39 f.). Precisely because believers are free from the law, they accept God's righteousness which creates a new life in them.<sup>1</sup>

"The law of the Spirit of life," this new norm is called, and as a "fruit of the Spirit" the life acceptable to God ripens in believers automatically (Rom. 8:2; Gal. 5:22). Freedom from the law does not set them free from the will of God. This new freedom of the new age now brings a new actuality to the will of God and to the law.

#### IV

Here, however, arises a new question: If even the men of the new age should "fulfill the requirement of the law" through the Spirit, and if, on the other hand, many parts of the law have only a "spiritual,"

1 Paul also attributes a certain significance to the fact that Jesus had fulfilled the law and in so doing had satisfied its requirement. He was "born under the law" and "knew no sin" (Gal. 4:4; II Cor. 5:21). When Jesus had fulfilled the law without sin, God on Calvary could "condemn sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3). But it is worth noting that this significance of the law was valid according to St. Paul even before the new age broke forth.

allegorical meaning, where is the boundary line between these two different sorts of commandments?

Being unused to the biblical conception of the two ages, we are inclined to apply our western logic to this question. To our way of thinking the problem would be easily solved if it could be proved that Paul divided the law into ritual statutes which have already become obsolete and ethical norms which reveal the permanently binding will of God. But this division Paul is not willing to make—as little as Jesus did according to the Gospels. It does not seem difficult to find the reason for this reservation. The above-mentioned total view characteristic of the Bible was in contradiction to such a division of the law; the will of God is one and indivisible. But in addition to this, Paul apparently did not draw such a boundary line because the binding of men to the ethical commandments could easily have led the believers into a new way of slavery, which in all circumstances was contradictory to the basic principles of the new age.

It seems, however, that the apostle may sometimes have given indications of such a division of the law commandments. Thus, for instance, he can write, “neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision, but keeping the commandments of God” (I Cor. 7:19). On the one hand this passage bespeaks a negative attitude toward the ritual commandments of the law, and on the other hand it bespeaks a positive attitude toward the ethical commandments. Keeping the ritual commandments would be worthless, for they are obsolete and are now to be understood only allegorically. On the contrary, the will of God, revealed in the ethical commandments which are permanently valid, has a binding force. This “keeping God’s commandments” is emphasized also by the statement that even “uncircumcision” is nothing. If someone imagines himself able to reach a higher level of spirituality by declaring himself to be free from the ritual commandments, then he has misunderstood the situation. “Uncircumcision is nothing.” There is only one thing that is important, namely, the keeping of God’s commandments, for in them the will of God, which is one and indivisible, is revealed.

The same view of the unity and indivisibility of the law is to be seen when Paul gathers its entire contents into one single commandment, the keeping of which embraces all the other commandments. The law contains a core, a center, out of which all other commandments may

be derived. This center is the commandment of love. "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself,' and 'he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law'" (Gal. 5:14; Rom. 13:8 ff.). It is obvious that Paul here agrees with his great Master (Math. 7:12; cf. 22:40). Thus also we find the explanation of the apostle's words that he seems to be "as one outside the law—not being without law toward God but under the law of Christ" (I Cor. 9:21; cf. Gal. 6:2). By the expression "under the law of Christ" he means that all of existence is seen from the new, eschatological point of view of the love of God—from the fulfillment in Christ.

Some examples may indicate what Paul means when he says that by love, i.e., the gift of the new age, the children of the new age fully meet and even go beyond the requirements of the law. Not the law alone but—what is more—the Lord himself has ordained that they who proclaim the Gospel should get their living by the Gospel. But Paul does not submit himself to this commandment. He goes beyond it by his act of love: he will have no pay for it (I Cor. 9:14 f.). On another occasion the question of the ritual ordinances concerning the eating of meat is dealt with. Here, too, love is the main point: lest I cause my brother to fall. For his part the apostle "will never eat meat" (Rom. 14:15; I Cor. 8:13). Thus the law and nomism in every form are overcome by the spirit-given love of the new age.

Here someone may remark that Paul uses imperative commandments in his statements. Does not Paul end up here, like Jesus in his Sermon on the Mount, in a new nomism? Far from it. Neither the Sermon on the Mount nor the numerous exhortations in the Pauline letters form a new law which could be used as a way to a new righteousness by works. They only contain examples showing how the new love works, how it is applied to different areas of life.

It is well known that Paul comes to his exhortations, his parenesis, only after first having set forth the gift of the Gospel in Jesus Christ. Thus the exhortations should be understood as a fruit of the good news. So also the acts of love in the new life should come forth spontaneously as a consequence of the acceptance of grace. This becomes perfectly clear if we pay attention to the context of the exhortations. "I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship" (Rom. 12:1). This exhortation is something very different

from the requirement of the law. The exhortation means that just as God gave man his grace for salvation, so God also bestows upon him the new task to become a participant in his own work (I Cor. 3:9; cf. I Cor. 6:1). In the very meaning of the word exhortation, *paraklesis*, there is not a requirement at all, but an act of comfort. Instead of placing himself above men, as the law does, the exhorter stands on the same level at their side (*para-*) as a "brother." And finally, it is true that the exhortation is clothed in the imperative form, but it receives its content through a reference to God's mercy, on the basis of which (*dia*) Paul speaks as an apostle and which now can become operative in a world ruled by sin. Thus this exhortation does not contain a requirement as the law does, but it gives to the man of the new age a task to perform in the service of divine love.

The love that is the fulfillment of the law is "poured" as a gift into the hearts of the believers "through the Holy Spirit"; good works come forth as fruits of this love (Rom. 5:5). The Spirit, the life-principle of the new age, can never be received through the law. Only Christ and faith mediate him to believers (Gal. 3:2).

Our discussion could be finished here. Paul has come to a positive evaluation of the law along his consistent eschatological line. As a proof for his claim to "uphold the law" he always brings the idea of fulfillment: the new age has already begun! Even the law must be viewed in this light. This was the case when he stated that the real meaning of the law could be understood only by those who interpreted it spiritually, not literally. The eschatological view was decisive when he stated that God has brought forth the new age in order that the requirements of the law might be fulfilled through the Spirit. And finally the same idea of the two ages was the basis of his statement concerning the new love as the fulfillment of the law.

There are still, however, other questions connected with those already treated. The law has a positive meaning for Paul—partly indirectly, partly directly—also in connections that have not yet been dealt with. Thus he says that the law indirectly prepares for the acceptance of grace as it drives man to the consciousness of sin (second use of the law). Further, he emphasizes the fact that, rightly interpreted, the law proves the correctness of the Gospel (the proof from Scripture). And finally the law often appears for Paul as the highest court when some controversy is to be solved (the supreme authority).

We must ask whether even in these connections Paul carried through his basic eschatological view consistently, or whether he here brings forth other viewpoints than the one which we have hitherto been able to discover, namely, the beginning the new age.

## V

The Jews were entirely wrong when they maintained that righteousness before God could be produced by the law. "Through the law comes knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20). Only indirectly does the law prepare the way for true righteousness, which God bestows upon man through his Gospel. But precisely here the law was necessary, for the Gospel presupposed a knowledge of sin, which the law alone was able to produce, although even the heathen had a "law" in their conscience (Rom. 2:14). Therefore in his missionary work the apostle made extensive use of the Old Testament and the law, so that even in the Greek congregations he could count on a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures. As "a custodian until Christ came" (Gal. 3:24) the law was highly appreciated also in Pauline congregations.

But this knowledge of sin which should drive men to Christ is not worked by the law if it is interpreted in the Jewish way. Before Paul met Christ he was through the law by no means a sinner, but "blameless" (Phil. 3:6). Only when Christ has fulfilled the law<sup>2</sup> can its "second use" be spoken of. In the light of the new age it is clear that the task of the law was "that every mouth may be stopped." This very fact was explained by the Scriptures to be God's purpose, that he will finally forgive all solely on the basis of his grace (Rom. 3:19; cf. Ezek. 16:63: "That you may remember and be confounded, and never open your mouth again because of your shame, when I forgive you all that you have done, says the Lord God"). The Scripture's own testimony is fulfilled. "We uphold the law!" (Rom. 3:31).

## VI

All Bible readers know that the "proof from Scripture" mentioned above has a decisive meaning for Paul. Here it will be considered only

2 Cf. Matt. 5:17. Undoubtedly one of the objectives of the Sermon on the Mount was to "stop every mouth" in order to make the listener "poor in Spirit," "hungering and thirsting for righteousness," so that the Gospel could bestow upon him the kingdom of heaven.

n so far as it is dependent purely in principle upon the law's positive meaning for Paul.

Paul's statement that it is precisely his Gospel which "upholds the law" refers to the fact that the law (= Old Testament) has predicted the way of salvation by faith. For it is the law which speaks of the promise to Abraham's faith (cf. Rom. 3:20 and Rom. 4). The promise makes the law to be more than only law in the strictest sense of the word. The law is for Paul no homogeneous entity. It consists of two opposite components, the commandment and the promise. Paul turns the promise, so to say, against the commandment.

According to Paul the Jews are mistaken when they bind the promise to works. In their opinion the law was already known to Abraham, to whom the promise of the future world was already given. According to the rabbis the promise referred to the reward for the works of faith: in so far as the law was obeyed, the promise also would be good.

Paul emphasizes the opposite. If the promise is to be realized at all, it must be wholly separated from works: "That is why it depends on faith, in order that the promise may rest on grace and be guaranteed to all his descendants" (Rom. 4:16). If its fulfillment depended on the law's commandments, the promises could never be realized, for "the law brings wrath" (Rom. 4:15). "For if the inheritance is by the law, it is no longer by promise," says the apostle (Gal. 3:18).

If these two, the promise and the law (i.e., the commandments), are compared, it will be clear that the promise is the more valuable, the primary, the life-giving, whereas the law is only something secondary, later in appearing. It has been a hindrance to the fulfillment of the promise. But the promise never can lose its validity. "God was able to do what he had promised" (Rom. 4:21; cf. 11:29). The superiority of the promise in comparison with the law already becomes clear from the fact that it was given to Abraham long before the law was given to Moses. According to the ancient conception, the older and the original has a greater value than that which has come later: the law entered later into the life of God's people (Rom. 5:20; Gal. 2:4). Further, Paul sees the superiority of the promise in the fact that it was given to Abraham directly without mediation, whereas the law "was ordained by angels through an intermediary" (Gal. 3:19).

If the distinction between the promise and the law in the above-mentioned cases is only quantitative, it becomes qualitative when Paul

ascertains that the law can never give life (Gal. 3:21), i.e., it can never give the Spirit. The promise belongs together with the Spirit. Thereby it acquires its superiority with regard to the law. For the Spirit is "the life-giving Spirit" (I Cor. 15:45). The promise is the creative word of God. Abraham received Isaac as a son of promise, who was born "through promise," i.e., "according to the Spirit" (Gal. 4:23, 29). The promise is considered by Paul as a creative word of the Christ-revelation in the Old Testament, as the Gospel of the Old Testament. (Luther is a faithful disciple of Paul when he states that the Old Testament is the word of God in so far as it "presents Christ.")

It was, however, Christ who with the new age finally realized the promise. For it was true also of the promise that it "was confined under the law, kept under restraint until faith should be revealed," until Christ came, who "redeemed us from the curse of the law, . . . that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. 3:23; 13 f.). Christ, who came with the new age, removed the law of the commandments as a hindrance so that the promise could become a reality (cf. Rom. 8:3; Eph. 2:14 f.). In him "all the promises of God find their Yes" (II Cor. 1:20). The new age has come and fulfilled all the promises of the Old Testament. In the righteousness of faith the law—i.e., the promise which is the core of the Old Testament—receives its crown. "We uphold the law."

## VII

The point of view of the eschatological fulfillment which Paul everywhere and without exception sets forth seems thus to settle every question concerning the law. Whatever detail is examined, everywhere this Scripture interpretation brings the solution. One exception, however, may be thought of. Does the apostle possibly fall back into a Jewish conception of Scripture when he seeks the supreme authority? Does the law here as law form the absolutely supreme authority?

Doubtless Scripture has authoritative power for his whole work. The doctrines of salvation, of the new life, and of the last things—the message is always based on the Old Testament. What extraordinary solemnity rests upon the statement "as it is written." The point of departure is always: "not as though the word of God had failed" (Rom. 9:6).

The Scripture is often personified in the rabbinical manner—for instance, when Paul says that the “scripture foresaw,” or when he says the scripture consigned all things to sin” and thereby means that “God as consigned all men to disobedience” (Gal. 3:8, 22; Rom. 11:32). Even the doctrine of inspiration represented by the synagogue is presupposed when he cites the Scripture as if it were wholly inspired by the Spirit. For instance, it is impossible to explain in any other way the statement, “For the scripture says to Pharaoh” (Rom. 9:17), which in its context means, “God said to Pharaoh.” And in other passages the subject is totally lacking, so that it can just as well be translated “God says” as “the scripture says” (II Cor. 6:2; cf. Rom. 9:25). In this meaning the law is “spiritual” (Rom. 7:14).

All this can only be interpreted to mean that even if the law as commandment occupies a lower position than the contents of the Scripture as a whole, this by no means diminishes the Scripture’s authority as the Spirit-given revelation. Paul seems to stand entirely on the foundation of the inheritance brought from the synagogue.

Nevertheless, the Jewish attitude has been broken in principle. Even if the law (= the Scripture) in many places seems to occupy the position of supreme authority, Paul knows something which stands above the Scripture. It is partly the new life in the age of the fulfillment, partly the word of Christ the Lord. When he speaks in one passage of the deplorable custom that “a woman prays to God with her head uncovered,” he first refers to the scriptural testimony, then to the teaching of nature, and finally to the decisive point, the custom of the church in the new age: “we recognize no other practice, nor do the churches of God” (I Cor. 11:16). Thereby the matter is definitely settled. A still greater importance, however, seems to rest upon the Lord’s own word as the highest and final authority. Wherever this word is referred to, the apostle stands before something absolutely binding, which can be transcended under no circumstances (I Cor. 7:10; 9:14; 11:23). Here is to be found an echo from the sayings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, “But I say to you . . .” Christ has come as the Messiah with this new law.

The same is the case with regard to church discipline. The synoptists already refer to an authority which stands above the law: where the law has proved powerless, the case must be brought before the church (Matt. 18:17). The same is true for Paul. He refers to the

church (I Cor. 6:1 ff.). But Christ stands above the church. The way in which the most difficult problems are to be solved is that the church shall assemble "with the power of the Lord Jesus" and thus make its decision. But finally the Lord Jesus Christ may in his day save even such persons who have been delivered unto Satan (I Cor. 5:5).

Here book religion has received its death-blow, and at the same time the Scripture's divine authority has been safeguarded. The Spirit of Christ must have the right to decide how the Scripture is to be interpreted. Even the final question, the question concerning the supreme authority, Paul solves consistently from the point of view of the fulfillment.

When Paul says that his Gospel "upholds the law" he means above all that the law has reached its goal in Christ and has been fulfilled by him. In him the law has received its crown. The action of God, to which the Old Testament (= the law) bears witness, is continued in Christ, who is also the Lord of the law.

To return to the point of departure, what did the opponents think of this method of proof? As it everywhere started from the fulfillment in Christ—or was ultimately based on it—they were compelled either to reject it and regard Paul as their archenemy or to accept Jesus as the Messiah, the bringer of the new age.

## Preaching as Direct Address

BY ERNEST G. WERNER

THE substance of preaching is not its method but its message. But perhaps an essay on method can be justified in the pages of a theological journal by observing that every method has some sort of implications about the material. Moreover, the material of preaching makes some demands of a method, so any *mere* method must be unreal. The question is, How well does any method tie in with the Gospel which is to be proclaimed?

It seems to me that some of the popular preaching methods are based on a fundamental mistake. These are the methods in which sermon preparation is treated as a *task in composition*, where literary and form considerations dominate the approach. The sermon, this view seems to imply, is an essay written to be read or delivered from memory, or it is a speech which, like other speeches nowadays, is sometimes printed in newspapers, is carefully reread, and seems to have an existence independent of its actual delivery. It is hard to say why this view is inadequate since we cannot do without the discipline of form and careful expression here implied. It would be too much to suggest that such methods have not served the Protestant pulpit well in their way. But if we are realistic, we must account for the typical weaknesses of the Protestant pulpit, and we must trace some of these weaknesses back to the methods of preparation and the understanding of preaching that supports them. Specifically, we might trace such typical failures as the boring sermon, the showpiece sermon, and the irrelevant sermon not only to the malpractice of a method but also to a method itself which interferes with *direct contact* between preacher and hearer.

If we look at preaching as direct address, we assume that direct contact is an element in all preaching and is not optional. Direct contact means more than that people are listening in; it means that people are held by the aggressiveness and tenacity of the preacher who has addressed himself to them in the fullest manner. He does not recite a sermon before them; he speaks to them, his very words being summoned in the contact he maintains with the people, and what happens

during this contact is the sermon. In this conception the seeking nature of the Gospel finds help in an appropriate preaching style. The evangelical sermon implicitly demands this, for it demands first and last a reaching out to people in which they are seized, taken, held, persuaded to believe!

We can therefore distinguish between two types of sermon preparation in which the first type regards the sermon as something that can be got on paper—and then got off again!—and the second regards the sermon as the *activity* of preaching the Gospel to listening people. The first type we assume to be very common, and its weakness is that its goal is divided between the sermon in manuscript and the sermon in delivery. Sometimes the preliminary goal overtakes the final goal. This method aims at getting the sermon down on paper first of all. It is a literary problem to be worked out by literary methods into a final draft. Then it is done, and the preparation moves into a second stage, that of assimilating the finished product into the mind and memory so that it may be delivered with utmost effect and verisimilitude. Nine out of ten, or perhaps ten out of ten, of the published sermons of “preaching greats” are of this type; and we take this situation for granted because of its prevalence and because people accept it and admire its more talented practitioners. Still, there is a contradiction in this method because the preacher’s efforts are bent on the recovery of the finished manuscript delivered with oratorical skill. Supreme talent, it will be said, can overcome this divided goal in performances of enormous power. Can it? Admitting that the performance may be powerful, it is still a performance. An earlier goal of this method (the finished manuscript) has overtaken the final goal (the delivery). If the manuscript *serves* the delivery, that is fine; but if the delivery serves the manuscript, that is not. And how can this really be avoided? The preacher knows, and the people sense, that success in this method consists in reviving the manuscript successfully, making it “live,” and that failure would consist in something like a memory lapse, or some extemporization and halting during a lapse, or some mistaken welding of the paragraphs during the demanding processes of delivery. This is how delivery comes to be admired as if it were something in itself. Again, no one complains about this. But is it the most effective preaching based on the most effective methods of preparation?

We think of the devices Protestant pulpits often resort to, stren-

ous efforts to "make" the sermon "interesting," preachers scouting for clever texts and preaching angles, inventing intriguing titles (which do not always intrigue), collecting anecdotes and illustrations, working on problems of sermon assimilation and delivery, looking out for topics—"sermons." The Word of God can certainly be preached under these circumstances, or it can be ignored. But even if it is preached in the content of the sermon, to what effect is it preached? The answer is bound to show that one way or another preacher and hearer are *too far apart!* If the preacher, regardless of literary skill, has not the preacher's gifts and resorts to reading the manuscript or relying continually on his notes, the result is usually that large stretches of the sermon lose all connection with the audience, whose attention may flare up now and then under the stimulus of some striking remark and as quickly die down. However, the successful preacher of this method is little better off, for even if he has the people listening, they are aware of his performance, his style, his delivery—they are spectators, and like all other spectators, they are at a safe distance! The dismay or the surprise of a genuine hearing of the Gospel is rarely present. The situation is inescapably secondhand.

If the literary or oratorical preacher finds himself losing his audience, he has only one recourse, and that is to intensify his efforts. He can strive harder to recapture the conversational inflection, bring off the casual gesture more brilliantly, speak louder or with more emotion: he can throw himself into his performance and outdo himself, but a performance it remains, with the preacher tracing his old steps. The hearers are able to sit back and watch. Now and then they pick up a phrase or a thought which strikes them as useful, or take some exhortation to heart, mainly on their own initiative. But the engagement of direct address is missing. And this is typical of so much preaching! The reason for it, for the Protestant preacher's bag of tricks, and for the customary boredom of his audience is that the preacher has become a man who delivers a finished product, more or less successfully; he is trying to revive a finished manuscript in a more or less successful imitation of authentic speech.

We should also note the fact that this religious-topics method is not fundamentally integrated with the Gospel. Is this because the finished lecture which the manuscript becomes helps to encourage the search for "different" topics, "interesting" subjects, etc? This lack of integration

is frighteningly exposed when the method produces gifted speakers on religious subjects who show no grasp of their commission consistently to preach the Gospel, that is, to prepare for its reception, communicate it, and draw out its implications for life. Sermons as treatments of independent religious subjects are produced by a method which has lost its evangelical core.

It would be a mistake, of course, to think that a minister can afford to repeat his version of the Gospel, or some aspect of it, week after week without destroying its effectiveness. There *is* a valid insight in the religious-topics method which the evangelical preacher cannot ignore, and that is that there are in human experience—as well as theologically—presuppositions and consequences of the Gospel which must be grasped, reviewed, understood, exposed, experienced before the Gospel itself can have a vital meaning through extensive reference to experience. The religious background of the Gospel must be supplied. That is why it is necessary to preach sermons on such non-evangelical subjects as the meaning of God, the significance of death, the elements of charity, etc. Most people in our pews have heard the fundamental Gospel assertions, often in a context that was not illuminating because it lacked extensive reference to life. With regard not to individuals but to our culture as a whole, the customary formulations of the Gospel have become dreadfully stale, and it is this which prevents the preacher of insight from blaming his people for not responding to the Gospel even when he preaches it. He looks instead to his own unimaginativeness, his inexperience with the Gospel, and the long history of sterile repetition and cultural saturation which has influenced him, and his hearers as well, in hundreds of their responses to the Gospel's familiar phrases.

These qualifications do not change the fundamental situation of the preacher as a man consecrated to the task of delivering a message which, for all its infinite wealth of application and expansion, is fundamentally one: "The grace of God has appeared for the salvation of all men!" There is actually no need to invent an intriguing title for this proclamation, to start it off with some freakish fragment of a text, to get a clever angle, or to "make" it "interesting" with the insertion of anecdotes and illustrations or by a dramatic manipulation of style. The need is to present the *Gospel* effectively, to speak it "from faith to faith" and from life to life, and this will expend every resource and energy the preacher has. Legitimate Christian preaching takes its start from the

Gospel and derives its methods from this Gospel to the completest possible extent.

Of course, the *sine qua non* of evangelical preaching is simply that the preacher have his eye on the Gospel all the time. Here we are not discussing how to integrate the total preaching method with the Gospel; we are discussing method only as it leads to direct address; but even this aspect of preaching method is integrated with the Gospel because it reflects the Gospel's character. It cannot substitute for intelligence, resourcefulness, honest conviction, and other personal qualities of the effective preacher. It cannot fill up the lack in the preacher who does not understand himself as one committed to a long-term proclamation of the Gospel. But a method may be either more or less appropriate to the Gospel, and this is the reason for preferring a second type of preparation in which everything is directed *from the start* to the situation of the preacher standing before an audience with a message and seeking to engage them vitally and effectively in the message's behalf. The preacher who addresses people directly knows that the Gospel he brings to them demands that he destroy every barrier and resist every temptation which would break his contact with his hearers, a contact he must first achieve and then maintain.

The basic character of the Gospel is its seeking nature (that God has begun, completed, and makes known the work of our salvation). The manner and method of preaching ought to reflect this. The preacher represents God's initiative in sending one to declare his tidings. The one continual restlessness in his work as evangelist is to find, connect, penetrate, seize, and hold—for all this is implied by the word *save*. Inattention on the part of the congregation is not "part of the game," but a fundamental challenge which he must face. One wonders, sometimes, how preachers can bear to drone on when they have plainly lost their audience, and how it is that they sometimes show no passion to communicate!

Eventually, the drive for maximum effectiveness in reaching out to get and hold a congregation will bring a man to direct address. It is implicit in faith and the Gospel, and hence in preaching itself, since preaching means bringing the Gospel to bear on the faith or unbelief of our hearers in an effort that taxes our own faith to its limit and brings us into the most direct, profound engagement with the people in behalf of God whom we represent. Faith often fails us, to be sure,

and we cannot preach except as men of faith; but if we do, by weekly graces, it is our desire to speak in a manner that is the most adequate vehicle of faith's communication because it is direct and spontaneous. The best assimilation of a manuscript cannot quite satisfy this need since it cannot escape all the circumstances, even if it escapes every appearance, of being a rehearsal.

The preacher who feels that the best part of his sermon may be lost through direct address is again falling back on the notion that the sermon is a manuscript or something that exists by itself, yet it is only in a secondary sense that the sermon has any existence apart from its delivery. The presentation of a well-turned, finished product is altogether secondary to the effective presentation of the Gospel in its full scope. The best part of the sermon, after all, is its living communication.

Sometimes in church meetings we have the opportunity to hear laymen speak. We notice that despite their lack of professional finish they are almost invariably effective in getting their message across, and the reason is that they are usually preoccupied with their message and speak extemporaneously and directly, with or without notes. They have not developed to the point of becoming method-conscious, and their effectiveness is a lesson to preachers. For while preachers cannot very well recapture this lost naivete, they can get their methods to serve for direct address. Yet this is not only a question of method; it implies something about the sermon itself, namely, that the sermon *is* the sermon-in-delivery, that it begins not with the selection of text or topic but with the impulse to declare the faith, and that this impulse is not aimed toward a false, easy target in the form of an essay or speech, but at the actual delivery when the hearers are welded by rapport and held by the face to face declaration of the preacher that is effective as people sense its immediacy, its spontaneity, and their own engagement with the preacher's faith.

This is not to ask for impromptu preaching. The conviction of this essay is that the extemporaneous element belongs to the essence of preaching, viewed dynamically, but it must be admitted that mere extemporaneousness is not a virtue. It exposes immediately any lack of preparedness in the preacher. It is loose, unorganized. It expands too freely, develops too easily away from the main point, becomes repetitious and tends to become superficial by relying on the inspiration of the moment, which cannot be guaranteed! Worst of all, I think, ex-

extemporaneous preaching that is something more than lazy repetitions of old thoughts generally fails to come to clear, exact expression and gives the hearer the feeling that the preacher has struggled unsuccessfully to bring out a shadowy, inarticulate mass of material. Public speaking and clear thinking are sufficiently demanding in themselves that the preacher should not try to practice them together in the time and opportunities given him. You cannot think creatively in public—except in conversation. And it is surely this failure at clear and adequate expression, rather than the bit of courage needed to speak extemporaneously, that has kept the average preacher (it seems) away from this method.

But is it necessary to choose between thorough preparation and extemporaneous preaching? Of course not. Extemporaneousness implies preparation, though it is different from the usual kind. There is no conflict between preparedness and extemporaneousness as long as *the goal of the preparation is extemporaneous preaching*.

The great factor in preparing to preach by direct address is the thorough, exhaustive expression of one's material beforehand. This is the cardinal principle of fluency and precision: the material must already have been expressed, and expressed does not mean frozen in a manuscript. I am assuming, of course, that material is there to be drawn on, and that this material is the Gospel along with its antecedents and consequences.

The problem of the preacher is that a moment is coming when he shall stand in the pulpit and must bear witness to the Gospel, and the question of his preaching method is, How shall he come to this moment with maximum preparedness that sacrifices nothing to the spontaneity and freedom, the forcefulness and rapport that are characteristic of direct address? The key to the problem is extensive articulation of the material beforehand.

What does extensive articulation mean? It means at least that the preacher expresses his subject thoroughly and clearly. He expresses it until he has got it all said. He may write it out. Why not? The advantages are finer precision and care; its disadvantages, that it increases the labor as well as the temptation to "save" the better phrases, the basic form, and all the best parts of the written manuscript, something that in the end means notes or memorization and leads back to the sermon as rehearsal. Or the preacher may speak his material into the air

in the privacy of his study, if he has a private study! He may think it through point by point. It really does not matter how he expresses the subject. His aim at this stage is to bring his material to its fullest expression. He will not confuse this expression with the sermon, even if he has turned to writing. The sermon is not till Sunday morning! The preacher at this point will accept no burden on his memory. Any memorized recall, any effort at recall has to be eliminated from the method of direct address. Obviously, there will be numerous places in the preached sermon where phrases and thoughts worked out ahead of time will be brought to mind and force themselves out. In fact, this principle is the very one we mean to exploit! But any effort at recall, even the mere fact of having a sermon learned, no matter how well, places invisible barriers between preacher and congregation. If the preacher's mind and energies are concentrated on recalling material, they cannot very well be concentrated on the congregation; and even if the people do not understand this, they will fail to experience the immediacy of direct address.

This extensive articulation may be done not only in a number of ways, but in several stages. One good way is to do it with the help of a tape recorder. The additional advantage of dictating into the tape recorder and listening back is that a sense of objectivity is gained. You look on your material from the outside: here you said too much, there not enough, and there—whatever *did* you intend to say? The essential message of your sermon emerges, not stereotyped in frozen sentences and paragraphs, yet readily expressible. The main subtopics become clear and arrange themselves. For the man of exceptional memory, this playback might result in memorization. The ordinary preacher might listen once or twice (no more than that) and should then dictate *from the start* into the recorder again. Remember, the sermon method from the start must help the man standing with a message before an audience and seeking to engage them directly. A number of fine gems of phrases may be lost in this way, it is true. The form of the material may be basically altered during a second recording, indicating, at least, that the form of the first recording was not quite inevitable! But in compensation for the distress and hard necessity of having to go from start to finish all over again, one will already have performed twice an effort nearly identical to the effort one must make on Sunday morning. Furthermore, one will have eliminated a number of weaknesses, including

this distracting gem of a phrase and that burden on the memory which is likely to deflect attention away from the people altogether. The preacher will have strengthened himself for the total effort which preaching will demand of him. Throughout his preparation his grasp is upon the actual circumstance of preaching in its entirety!

This pre-preaching is plainly optional. I can imagine a man feeling the artificiality of preaching by himself, or the mature preacher able to dispense with this stage altogether. But the underlying principle must in some way be carried through: an extensive articulation of the material one must have. And this is enough.

During the course of articulation, a certain direction, a certain outline will probably come to light. This much one cannot help memorizing, probably, but this much will not interpose a barrier between preacher and hearers. Running over the main steps may even be a help in getting the essentials of a sermon, something that is much harder when working with a prepared manuscript. With an overview of his material, a grasp of its essence and the ability to state his main points, the preacher is ready to preach if he has thoroughly gone through his material before.

The miracle of articulated material is that, provided the work has been done in writing, thought, speech recorded or unrecorded—provided the material has been mastered for expression—it will offer itself for use under an infinite variety of situations. *It will offer itself!* There is little or no conscious effort to recall. Some of the previous expressions are bound to crop in, yet this is not to say that one will express the material in the same way, and sometimes the best expressions come out quite new during delivery. You can draw freely on this material without the effort of remembering, whether you speak for five minutes or an hour. Articulation does not guarantee that you will be able to recall things, but that you will be able to *say* them (of course, a type of unconscious recall is going on automatically). The extemporaneous preacher's endeavor is not to remember but only to speak, and to do that with freedom and mastery. Thoughts and words are bound to come if you are dealing with material that you have brought to expression before.

Extemporaneous preaching, then, is not *impromptu*, spur-of-the-moment stumbling and groping in the pulpit, a painful experience for all. It is direct address that draws on a reservoir of articulated material that *will* and *must* offer itself for the most flexible use. There is, in

preaching of this sort, a continual adaptation to the reaction of the audience; this happens naturally, and it is most valuable in sustaining the contact and getting the message across effectively. Enthusiasm develops rapidly and fervently during extemporaneous preaching, and what is more, it is real, not worked up ahead of time, written into a manuscript, and then prodded awake. But even in the quiet, calm-to-the-end sermon, the preacher's hold on the people is immeasurably greater when they are not spectators of a performance but auditors held by direct address.

It remains only to remind ourselves that no single preaching method can matter as much as persistence in the effort to keep the preaching of the Gospel alive.

# The Status of Women Workers in the Church

BY RAYMOND T. STAMM

THE function of the church on earth is to continue the work of Christ, which is to communicate life that is everlasting and worth living forever. The right teaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments (Augsburg Confession, Art. VII) are two means to this end; they are not ends themselves. The church is the body of believers who are sent to do not only the works which Jesus did, but "greater works than these" (John 14:12; 17:18; 20:21). That is the daily business of *every* member of the church, and not only of those who have been ordained to preach and to administer the sacraments. The growing work of the church is too extensive for its elected or appointed officials to accomplish by themselves, and the Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers has to take account of the Christian as one whom Jesus has sent into this world as God the Father has sent him. In this respect there can be no distinction either between clergy and laity or between male and female.

Unfortunately, however, the work of women in the church is still constricted by lingering remnants of the primeval masculine assumption of woman's inferiority to man. This happens partly because of the tenacity of obsolescent social customs and partly because of the mistaken belief that giving equal status to women in the church of the twentieth century is prohibited by I Cor. 11:2-16, 14:33-36, and I Tim. 2:8-15. Consequently, any discussion of the function, preparation, and status of full-time women workers in the church needs to begin by comparing the position of women in the New Testament world with their changed and changing situation today. In our investigation we shall contrast the actual role of women in that world with what the religious leaders who wanted to keep them in their place thought it ought to be.

## I. THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WORLD

The traditional status of woman as these spokesmen for religion wanted to maintain it is reflected in their prayer in which a man thanks his God that he is not an unbeliever, not uneducated, not a woman, and not a slave. This was the oriental attitude, but it was shared also by the Greeks. Among the Romans the position of woman was comparatively high; the original absolute authority of the husband had lessened, and it was customary for him to address his wife as *domina*. In Roman houses women were not restricted to their own quarters, and a Roman wife was free to appear in public.

In Old Testament times women were treated more as property than as persons in their own right from a legal standpoint. When a woman married she passed from the power of her father into that of her husband, who in every respect became her lord. In New Testament times there were some factors of retrogression rather than progress beyond the Old Testament. "Blessed is he whose children are male and woe to him whose children are females" (b Qid. 82 b) expresses the relative esteem in which women were held in some circles. As compared with the honorable title "son of Abraham," the corresponding "daughter of Abraham" seldom appears. Women were reputed to be lazy, jealous, frivolous, and eager to listen to gossip: "Ten measures of talkativeness came into the world; and woman received nine of them, the rest of the world one" (b Qid. 49 b). Hillel (20 B.C.) said, "More women, more witchcraft" (Aboth 2:8). One was not to talk much with women, not even with one's own wife (Aboth 1:5).

Woman's place was in the home. The preference was that the women, especially the young unmarried women, should not go out at all. Markets, councils, courts, festival processions, and crowds were the affairs of men, while the care of the house belonged to the women. Philo said that the Jewish women in Alexandria did not go outside the door of the courtyard, and that the young women looked after the women's quarters and out of modesty avoided the gaze of men, even of their close relatives (*Against Flaccus*, 11, 89). That this practice of seclusion existed also in other places than in Alexandria is shown, for example, by II Macc. 3:19; IV Macc. 18:7; Josephus, *Antiquities*, 15:7.5.

Accordingly, in Judaism of this type a girl's education consisted in learning to do housework, including spinning and weaving and watching over her younger brothers and sisters. Girls were not required to study the Torah. In fact, Rabbi Eliezer (A.D. 90), a strenuous advocate of the restrictive tradition, went so far as to say, "He who teaches his daughter Torah teaches her to be wanton." The schools were only for boys, not for girls, and in the synagogues the schoolroom was open only to men and boys. Nevertheless, in prominent wealthy families girls were given a secular education—for example, learning Greek because it would be an ornament to them.

From Athens, likewise, there is evidence that in the classical period women had no claim to an education. It was believed that teaching the sciences to women would only increase the poison of a fearful serpent; a house in which woman had the first word would be hopelessly destroyed. It was the courtesans who were educated. In Roman Stoicism, on the other hand, there were efforts to make women's education like that of men; if male and female horses and dogs could be trained to hunt together, why not educate boys and girls alike?

The status and educational privileges accorded to women naturally affected their participation in the activities of the religious cults. Some cults admitted, others excluded them. Women were prominent in the cult of Isis, but were barred

from that of Mithras; but the cult of Mithras was associated with the cult of Cybele, which was open to women. There were also cults for women from which men were excluded. Albrecht Oepke in his article on the Greek word *gune*, "woman," says,

In all antiquity the participation of woman in the cultus is the rule, not only in the family cult but also in the public cults and in the celebrations of the mysteries. There are festivals which only women may attend. Sometimes these are open to all women, sometimes only to married women of faultless repute who have prepared themselves by nine days of abstinence. Examples are the Thesmophoria, Skirophoria, Braunia, and Adonia in Attica and the seven-day festival of Demeter Mysia in Pellene. On the other hand, certain temples, such as the temple of Aphrodite Akraia on the Cyprian Olympus, are closed to women. In the cult of Dionysus women play a prominent part as Maenads and Thyades. Very often there are priestesses, both in the public cults (e.g., vestals) and in the mysteries (female hierophants in Eleusis, priestesses of Isis, etc.). Their service was not limited to feminine circles. An unusual ecstatic endowment assured a woman of prophetic rank as a sibyl; the best known special case is the Pythia in Delphi.<sup>1</sup>

In Israel there were no priestesses of Jahweh. Yet in the Old Testament women were not excluded from participating in the cult. They took part in the religious folk festivals, in cultic dances, and in sacrificial meals and the Passover. Women, children, and strangers joined in the covenant with Jahweh (Deut. 29:10-15); and according to Ex. 38.8 women ministered at the door of the tent of meeting. Some women—for example, Miriam and Hulda—had the gift of prophecy.

In New Testament times, however, the role of women in public worship was restricted. When they attended the temple services they were not permitted to go beyond the court of the women, and they were not allowed even there during the period of their monthly purification and for forty days after the birth of a male, eighty days after the birth of a female child. On the basis of Deut. 31:12, women were required to attend the services of the synagogue. But their place was behind a screen, and they were only listeners. In theory they were on the list of those who might be called on to read the scripture lessons in the course of the service, but in practice they were not allowed to do so; nor were they allowed to teach. The exegesis of the Torah and the discussion of theological questions were affairs of men.

Commenting on I Cor. 14:35, Strack-Billerbeck (III, p. 468) says "On the question whether women were to be educated in the Torah there was no unanimity. Probably the general opinion inclined to the view that a father was at least under no obligation to have his daughter educated in the Scripture." In observance of the Torah, woman was not in a position of equality with man. She was subject to all its *prohibitions*, and to all the severity of its legal penalties, including the death

1 Gerhard Kittel, ed., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. II (Stuttgart, 1935), pp. 78-87.

penalty. But when it came to the *positive* commands the principle was, "Men are in duty bound to all the commandments that are to be observed at stated places, while women are free from them."

Examples of observances from which women were free by this rule are the pilgrimages to Jerusalem at Easter, Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles. Women did not have to live in booths ("tabernacles"); they did not need to blow the trumpet on New Year's Day; and they were not required to read the book of Esther at Purim. They were free from the daily recitation of the Shema; and together with slaves and minor children they did not need to wear the prayer fringes. At table they joined in saying the blessing at the beginning of the meal but they did not recite the common prayer of thanks after meals as the men did. Probably they were obligated to say the daily prayer and use the ceremony connected with the mezzuzah. "Women, gentile slaves and minor children" is a combination that is frequent in the rabbinical writings, and it reflects the position of women under the Torah among those who used it. In religious matters the wife, like minors and slaves, was subject to her husband.

But it would be quite unfair to take what we have thus far said as if it were the *whole* picture of the status of women in the ancient world, whether Jewish or Greek. In classical Greece the unequal position of women did not prevent the rise of such celebrated persons as Helen of Troy, Antigone, Cassandra, Clytemnestra, Iphigenia, and Euryklea. Among the Dorians women were freer than in Athens, and the women of Sparta were noted for their pride. Even Menander, who wrote so much that was derogatory to women, could say, "A wise woman is a treasure of virtue." Plato, being influenced by the Dorian attitude, made women equal to men in his ideal republic. Actually, even in public life, able women exercised a surprisingly independent and influential role, especially in Asia Minor, but also in Greece itself; and the same thing was true in New Testament times.

The hiatus between the actual role of women in human society and the most conservative ideal of what it ought to be is reflected in the book of Proverbs, where derogatory statements about them are balanced by genuine appreciation, for example, Prov. 12:4; 18:22; 19:14; 31:10-31. So also in Sirach, whose absurdities do not altogether exclude a more favorable view (for references see below). At the courts of the Hasmonean kings and of the Herodians little attention was paid to these restrictive customs. For nine years (76-67 B.C.), Queen Alexandra held power and ruled with a circumspection and energy that matched the Ptolemaic and Seleucid princes. Then there was the sister of Antigonus, who was the last of the Hasmonean kings (40-37 B.C.); she defended the fortress of Hyrcania against the troops of Herod the Great.<sup>2</sup> In the New Testament itself we have Herodias and daughter notorious for dancing (Mk. 6:22; Mt. 14:6). Twice a year, on the 15th of Ab and on the Day of Atonement, young women danced in the vineyards

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, *Wars*, I, 19:1.

around Jerusalem exhibiting their accomplishments before the young men; according to the Palestinian Talmud, even the daughters of the best families took part in these dances.

The most important factor which kept these restrictive customs from being pressed to the absurd lengths desiderated by spokesmen for the extremists was their impracticability for the rank and file of the middle and lower classes of the people. It was one thing for aristocratic gentlefolk in the cities to observe them, but quite another for the poorer classes in the country, where girls had to fetch water from the village well and where wives hired out with their husbands and children to work in the fields. There were also other occupations in which the wife had to help her husband in work that precluded her observance of these conservative refinements of ancient customs. "There is no evidence," says J. Jeremias, "that the custom of wearing a veil was observed in the country as strictly as it was in the city; rather in this respect there was a difference between town and country similar to that which obtains in Palestine today. Yet a woman was not supposed to be alone in a field, and even in the country any conversation of a man with a woman who was a stranger to him was unusual (cf. John 4:27)."<sup>3</sup>

Not all the rabbis were of the same opinion about these restrictions. Some of them paid especial tribute to their wives, as for example R. Akiba to his wife Rachel. When he moved to the school where he studied and taught she remained at home in poverty, making great sacrifices to make his study possible. Looking back over their life together, Akiba said, "Everything we have we owe to her," and he presented her with a diadem on which the pinnacles of the Holy City were pictured. This is a symbol of a married life led by two people who were completely devoted to the service of their God and of their people.<sup>4</sup> Yet as we might say today, it was Akiba and not Rachel who held the degree of doctor of Torah; her role was to do all she could to make it possible for her husband to study and become expert in theology.

Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls so far published confirms this picture of the subordination of women in New Testament times. Concerning the question whether there were women in the Qumran community Millar Burrows has this to say:

Women are not mentioned in the portions of the Manual of Discipline bought by Archbishop Samuel. The first line of the first column originally contained a word of which only the last three letters are now left. Brownlee conjectures that this was the Hebrew word for women; it might equally well, however, have been a word meaning men, or any one of a number of other words. In the last column there is an expression which at first sight seems to mean "holy daughters," and a few scholars have actually supposed this to be the meaning. There is

<sup>3</sup> Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*. Teil II: *Die sozialen Verhältnisse* (Göttingen, 1937), 235-236.

<sup>4</sup> Kittel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 647.

no place for these devout ladies in the context, however, and the words should undoubtedly be read as "building of holiness" or "holy building."

Brownlee sees a reference to marriage in the statement that the "sons of truth" are "to bear seed with all everlasting blessing," but few are likely to accept that interpretation. The Damascus Document, on the other hand, clearly contemplates a group of married men with families, and the additional columns from the Manual of Discipline or a closely related document, which were acquired by the Palestine Museum, mention explicitly women and children. Skeletons of women were found in some of the graves in the cemetery of Qumran. Probably the sect included both communities of celibates and settlements of families. It is possible also that a few women of eminent saintliness were buried in the cemetery of the order even if no women were admitted as members.<sup>5</sup>

Whatever additional information future discoveries and further study of these documents may bring, any discussion of the role of women in the church that appeals to the New Testament for its sanction will still have to reckon with the block to progress which consisted then, and consists today, in setting up obsolescent notions of decorum as the ideal status of women in the church. It is clear that in New Testament times women were not treated as equal to men in matters of religion and theology. The male assumption of intellectual superiority over women appears in all its masculine self-assurance in Philo's allegorical interpretation of the creation story in the book of Genesis: "Pleasure does not venture to bring her wiles and deceptions to bear on the man, but on the woman, and by her means on him. This is a telling and well-made point; for in us mind corresponds to man, the senses to woman."<sup>6</sup>

Whether Philo, in the light of the social changes of 1900 years since his day, would still consider his argument telling and his point well made is not for us to know. But if we believe that what Paul says in Gal. 3:28 is true, we can be sure that any attempt to fix the status of women in the church that rests on the assumption of male superiority is foredoomed to fail by the sheer fact of what women actually are and are doing, and are going to keep on being and doing in the kingdom of God. Appeal to the authority of Scripture will not save this attempt from futility, and meanwhile its futility will be equaled only by the hypocrisy it must continue to generate.

The high type of family life actually achieved in Judaism is all the greater tribute to the spiritual influence the women were able to exert despite the handicap of their unequal status. It is true that many of the restrictions under which they labored were deemed necessary in order to preserve the integrity of the Jewish religion under deadly attack by enemies who were bent on destroying it. But whatever they may have contributed to this end, they are not relevant to our changed and changing situation today. Paul's desire to maintain these customs in his churches explains the gap between his new ideal of equal status for women in

5 Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1955), p. 233.

6 Philo, *On the Creation* (Loeb translation), 165.

Gal. 3:28 and his prescription in I Cor. 11:2-16, 14:34-36, and II Cor. 11:3, 7 to remedy the ecstatic chaos which threatened regress to the old pagan ways. Whatever, in view of the social customs and moral conditions in Corinth, may properly be said to explain this gap, there can be little doubt that Paul himself, being a man of his day, saw pretty much eye to eye with Philo and the rabbis on this question of maintaining the customs that dictated the decorum of women.

## II. THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH

Equality of status for women as members of the church is a logical implication of Paul's conception of salvation by God's grace alone through faith in Christ. What Jesus had said and done to change man's attitude and treatment of women is well summarized by Albrecht Oepke:

Jesus is not the radical reformer who proclaims rights and tries to force a revolution in relationships, but he is the Saviour who gives himself to the lowly and oppressed and who summons all without distinction to the freedom of God's reign. There is a characteristic minor trait in the Synoptic Gospels which shows how often and how delightfully Jesus in his parables concerns himself with the daily life of women, their cares and their joys (Matt. 13:33; 25:1 ff.; Luke 15:8 ff.; 18:1 ff.). The parables of the rabbis are much poorer in such traits. Where it was necessary, Jesus took Jewish deportment into account; for example, he did not go to the sick-bed of Jairus' daughter without taking witnesses with him (Mk. 5:40). On the other hand, with a clear understanding of what he was doing, he broke through rigid Jewish custom in order to fulfill his mission also in relation to women. He did not shrink from talking with a woman (John 4:27, etc.), nor even from teaching a woman (Luke 10:39). One woman he called "a daughter of Abraham" (Luke 13:16). He gladly intervened in behalf of women (Mark 12:40 par, 41 ff. par; 14:6 ff. par), and he helped women in need of help more than the rabbis did (Mark 1:29 ff. par; 5:21-23 par; 7:24-30 par; Luke 13:10-17; 8:2; 7:11-17; John 11:1-44). For the sake of a woman who was sick he broke the sabbath (Luke 13:10 ff.), and he did not shrink even from contact with an unclean woman (Mark 1:31 par; 5:27 ff. par, 41 par; Luke 7:38 ff.). The Gospel of John, whatever may be said about the historicity of details, does not falsify the picture when it shows Jesus striving for the soul of a woman (John 4:7 ff.). Jesus is surrounded with many women disciples who are close to him in his suffering (Mark 15:40 f. par, 47 par) and at his glorification (Mark 16:1 ff. par; John 20:1, 11 ff.). He also has an uncommon influence on women who stand at a distance from him, and he knows how to deepen it (Luke 11:27 f.; 23:27 ff.; cf. Matt. 27:19). Nowhere do we find in the mouth of Jesus a depreciation of women as women. When he holds out the prospect of sexless existence like the angels in the kingdom of God in heaven (Mark 12:25 par), he removes from woman, by implication first of all, the curse of her sex and places her at man's side as a child of God with equal rights.<sup>7</sup>

Jesus had many women disciples but he did not choose any of them to be one of his twelve apostles. Yet from the very beginning the service rendered by women was essential to the founding of his church. The importance of their contribution to his ministry is evident from Luke 8:3, which says that certain women of means ministered (*diekonoun*) to him. But this ministry by women was not limited to

<sup>7</sup> In Kittel, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 784-785.

giving financial support to Jesus and his growing church. To grasp its potential inclusiveness, we have to study the history of the Greek verb *diakoneo* and its usage in the New Testament.

The original sense of *diakoneo* is illustrated from Herodotus, where it means to wait on tables, and especially to present foretasted meat or drink; to prepare a wedding feast; and to provide the necessities of life. In non-Christian usage *diakonos*, the name for servant which is derived from this verb, never lost its original association with waiting on tables. In the Greek inscriptions which give lists of the officers of private religious associations, *diakonos* follows *mageiros*, butcher; and in one instance it is followed by *archoirochous*, chief cup-bearer. In Egypt there was a *koinon ton diakonon*, which may have been a butlers' union.

Out of this original usage there developed the more general meaning, to serve. So in the New Testament, *diakoneo*, in addition to being used of waiting on tables and preparing meals, is employed to express every action which is prompted by the grace-gifts that are given to the members of the church by the Holy Spirit—for example, the grace of giving which is manifested in gathering and delivering the offering for the relief of the poor in Jerusalem. Again, in Matt. 25:44 we see the inclusiveness of this verb: "Lord, when did we see thee hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison, and did not minister [*ou diakonesamen*] to thee?" In this parable, service rendered to man is at the same time service rendered to the Son of man. For a Christian, who by definition is a person who is sent as Jesus was sent, this way of service is *the* way of life. As a *diakonos*, his life is a full-time self-investment in the lives of others, an existence for others for the sake of Jesus, both in life and in death (Luke 22:27; John 17:18; 20:21). Wherever Jesus is, that is, in every place where the sin of the world has to be taken away, his servant (*diakonos*) must be also (John 1:29; 12:26).

This distinctive way of living and of being, first of all by being servant (*diakonos*) of all, stands in sharp contrast to the Greek conception of *diakoneo*, serve, *diakonia*, service, and *diakonos*, servant. The Greek ideal was a full development of the individual person. A well-rounded man was worthy to *rule* and not to have to serve somebody else in the menial tasks of life. Only when used in reference to the citizen's service of his state was the service expressed by these words rated higher. Menial service was appropriate for slaves rather than for free men. But Jews and other Orientals took the master-slave relationship as a matter of course and saw nothing degrading in the service rendered by a slave. For example, the Septuagint lacks the verb *diakoneo* and uses *douleuo*, to serve as a slave; its use of *diakonos* is rare and only in the secular sense. But in the Gospel of John the disciples of Jesus are not his slaves but his friends (15:14-15), who act as his *diakonoι*, his servants. In Judaism, the pupils of the rabbis were their *diakonoι*.

Jesus' conception of the service expressed by *diakoneo*, *diakonia*, and *diakonos* grows out of the Old Testament command to love one's neighbors as one's self

and God with all one's heart, mind, soul, and strength. So far from being degrading, such service was fit for angels (Mark 1:13; Matt. 4:11). Jesus himself set such an example of humble service that Paul in describing the mind of Christ to the Philippians called it slavery. Jesus, he said, although he was the Son of God, "emptied himself and took the form of a *doulos*, a slave."

True to the teaching and example of Jesus, the nascent church made the function of the *diakonos* a symbol of all charitable care for others. Every activity in the congregation that was important for its upbuilding was called a *diakonia*, a service. Examples are Acts 1:17, 25; 6:2; 20:24; 21:19; Rom. 11:13; II Cor. 3:7-9; 4:1; 5:18; 6:3; 11:8; Col. 4:17; I Tim. 1:12; II Tim. 4:5, 11.

It is essential to observe that the service expressed by *diakoneo*, *diakonia*, and *diakonos* was not limited to serving in the sphere of material things. Stephen, though appointed to serve tables, also preached—and preached to such effect that he was stoned to death, leaving a legacy of service that is given more space in the New Testament record than that of any of the original twelve apostles except Peter. His *diakonia* was a balanced combination of what are today too often divorced as "material" versus "spiritual" things.

One link between the spiritual and material functions of the ministry (*diakonia*) was service at the common meals which were followed by the Lord's Supper. But while making this observation one must remember that the Hebrews did not separate material from spiritual things in our modern fashion. The function of the *diakonos* was inclusive of both the physical and the spiritual needs of the members of the church, and it was discharged by preaching, assisting in the services of worship, caring for the poor, visiting the sick and the prisoners, and doing anything else that required doing to build up the church. In short, the propagation of the Gospel, which was the communication of eternal life, was the all-inclusive *diakonia* of each and every Christian.

For this purpose God had endowed each member of the church with a particular spiritual gift, the proper use of which constituted his part in the service (*diakonia*) of building the body of Christ. These gifts were given in great variety (I Pet. 4:10), and they were to be used by each for the good of all and by all for the good of each. Paul's word for this variety is *diaireseis* (I Cor. 12:4), and the varieties it indicates are given in Rom. 12:4-8; I Cor. 12:4-11, 28; and Eph. 4:11-12. Very few, if any, possessed all of these gifts; some had more than one, others only one.

*Diakoneo*, *diakonia*, and *diakonos* are therefore inclusive words. The first expresses the action which is the outworking of all these spiritual gifts; the second is the name of this service; and the third is the actor who performs it. The inclusive character of *diakoneo* is illustrated in II Cor. 3:3, where the Corinthian Christians are a letter of Christ ministered (*diakonetheisa*), that is, written by Paul at Christ's dictation, not with ink but with the Spirit and mind of Christ on tablets

of the human heart. That is to say, the service of Paul and of each and every other Christian is to function as Christ's *diakonos* to propagate the life that is eternal and worth living forever. For this reason, says Paul, there must be no discord in the body of Christ. Instead, all the believers are to have the same care (*merimnosin*) for one another (I Cor. 12:25). This mutual concern of each for all and of all for each (Gal. 6:2, 5) is the inclusive function of every office and of every officer in the growing church, all for the sake of Christ, in whom "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Gal. 3:28).

This means that the men and women of the church are equal in respect to the motivation of their service, and that every member is bound by the love of Christ to serve him by serving human beings in every kind of need (Matt. 25:34-46). Women were not merely the recipients (Acts 6:1; 9:39) but the givers of charitable help, as, for example, Dorcas (Acts 9:36-43), who "was full of good works and of charity." There is Lydia (Acts 16:14-15), and Phoebe and the rest of the women in Romans 16, Prisca, Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Persis, the mother of Rufus, Julia and the sister of Nereus, and Olympas; and at Philippi, Euodia and Syntyche, who labored side by side with Paul (Phil. 4:2-3). As conceived by the writer of I Timothy, the task of a woman worker in the church was to be "well attested for her good deeds, as one who has brought up children, shown hospitality, washed the feet of the saints, relieved the afflicted, and devoted herself to doing good in every way" (I Tim. 5:10). In short, they were to be Marthas and keep busy with much serving.

But what of the Marys who sat at the teacher's feet and listened to his teaching? Were they to learn only for their own edification, or were they to put their knowledge to use in preaching and teaching others? The answer of the man who wrote I Timothy is an application of what Paul wrote in I Cor. 11:2-16; 14:34-36, and II Cor. 11:3. It is sharp, and he will brook no contradiction: "Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent" (I Tim. 2:11). But there is at least this much to be said about his rule: he does allow the women to listen, provided they do not talk back and ask questions, and that is a liberal concession as compared with the position of R. Eliezer (cf. above), who went so far as to say, "May the words of the Torah be burned rather than deliver them to women."<sup>8</sup>

I Cor. 11:5 seems to imply that women actually did pray and prophesy in the meetings of the Christians in Corinth. If they did not, or if Paul had meant to prohibit it altogether, there would have been no need for him to intrude the statement in verse 5 into his discussion at this point, thereby further to complicate his already limping argument to prove that women ought to wear veils. On the

8 Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 4 vols. (Munich, 1922-28), III, p. 468, citing p Sota 3, 19a, 3.

other hand, I Cor. 14:34-36 forbids women to speak in the churches and therefore seems to contradict what Paul has said in 11:5. One way of resolving the difficulty would be to say that Paul's intention may have been merely to forbid a self-assertion which would violate the proprieties to which women were subject in those days, but that he may have granted exceptions in the case of women who possessed the genuine gift of prophecy. Another way would be to reject I Cor. 14:34-35 on text-critical grounds and explain these verses as a later insertion by some one who took a more rigorous stand on this matter. Nestle's note cites evidence pointing to this possibility. Albrecht Oepke suggests that these two verses may be the product of a developing church order and that they may have been inserted here on the basis of I Tim. 2:12, which other interpreters think is dependent on the Corinthian passage.<sup>9</sup> This might have been the case, but we do not know. It is not impossible that Paul's labored argument did get him into a contradiction, and neither suggestion for freeing him of it is altogether satisfying. It shows not only a concession to the social customs of Paul's day, but also a continuing tension in his mind between his new ideal of equal status for all in Jesus Christ and his own personal preferences for the decorum of women.

This restriction on the participation of women in church services was one of the factors that led to the development of the heresies. As Oepke observes, the freedom of women to teach in public was preserved only among the sects. Examples are Thecla in the Acts of Paul; Priscilla, Maximilla, and Quintilla in Montanism, and the role of women in Gnosticism.

In the churches where orthodoxy prevailed the task of women was to contribute financial support to missionaries and traveling officials; to furnish lodging and meals to them, as Lydia did; to nurse the sick; to help to provide clothing for the poor, as Dorcas did; and to bring up children. These and many other things were done by the women of the church from the very beginning, being prompted by the Spirit who gave to each her particular spiritual gift to build up Christ's body, the church. But the greatest of these gifts was the love (*agape*) which motivated their service and which was given impartially to all, regardless of social status, race, nationality, color, or sex.

Thus the women of the church served spontaneously and unofficially long before any of them enjoyed official status. But the same observation holds true for men. In both cases the service came first over a period of time during which the Holy Spirit prompted each individual to exercise his or her spiritual gift. But as the confusion in the churches in Corinth indicates, this state of affairs could not last. The new life in Christ had to be regulated. According to Paul it was the Spirit and mind of Christ that was creating and maintaining the unity of the members of the body of Christ. But as the confusions prevailed, the leaders of the church began to appeal to the *members* to maintain the unity in order that the

9 In Kittel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 788.

Holy Spirit might dwell with them: it was they who had to maintain the unity of the Spirit!

The shift of emphasis is significant. The same Spirit was at work, but he was now acting through male administrative officials. As the emphasis changed there were, as Oepke points out, three potential effects on the activity of women in the service of the church: it might gradually cease; it might degenerate into heresy (Rev. 2:20), so that a more temperate sense of churchly propriety would have to oppose it (cf. I Tim. 2:11-15; 5:13); or it might learn how to integrate itself into the rules of an ordered church administration. Conditions in our own churches today show that each of these three possibilities is still open, and that the current discussion of the function, preparation, and status of women workers in the church needs to be concerned with avoiding the first two while perfecting the third of these alternatives.

Christianity did not create the types of service and the titles of its administrators out of nothing. These already existed in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek languages to designate political and religious officers, and they were waiting for Christian adoption, ready to be filled with the Spirit and mind of Christ. As we have seen, salvation by God's grace alone through faith in Christ gave every member of the church equality before God with respect to the basis of this salvation. Ideally there must be neither factions nor schisms in the body of Christ. On the other hand, its unity did not mean the uniformity of its members. There was to be a variety in the unity, the variety and unity of many members, each with his or her own talent for service as a spiritual gift of God's grace. Naturally, those members with spiritual initiative and practical wisdom came to the fore as leaders whose advice was taken and whose decisions were carried out. The titles of these leaders and the names of the offices which they came to hold were taken over from the Jewish and Graeco-Roman political and religious environment of the nascent Christian movement.

In those first days of Christianity, the establishment of a new congregation did not begin by drawing up a constitution with a list of offices and of the qualifications, duties, and prerogatives of officers to be elected to fill them. Jesus himself had chosen twelve special helpers on the basis of their capacity to help him to carry out the task which he announced in his sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth at the beginning of his ministry (Luke 4:18-19). After his death they continued his work and appointed others to special tasks, as Jesus had appointed them; for example, in Acts 6:1-6, where the choice of the seven helpers of the apostles was determined by their ability to meet the following test: They must be men "of good repute, full of the Spirit and of wisdom." That is to say, they had to have demonstrated previously their initiative and their practical administrative ability. As we might say today, they had to pass an aptitude test; only it was a much less

formal test, and those who gave it laid the emphasis on the Holy Spirit whose guidance they felt as they were administering it.

In I Cor. 16:16, Paul urges his readers to be subject to such men as Stephanas. Commenting on this passage, C. T. Craig says, "If the church is *to be subject to such men*, they must have been church officials of some kind. But they are described with the same vagueness as the leaders in I Thess. 5:12, suggesting the absence at this time in the Pauline churches of fixed nomenclature for administrators. We meet the noun *diakonia* (ministry) in vs. 15; and the verb *kopiaō* appears also in I Tim. 5:17 in the description of the work of the elders."<sup>10</sup> The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls indicates that we need not assume that a long period of years was required for this shift of emphasis from a Spirit-filled to an officer-administered Christian society. On this point the concluding paragraph of Bo Reicke's study of the Qumran Manual and the Damascus Document is relevant and important:

The two Jewish documents which we have dealt with in this essay, and which are close to primitive Christianity in terms of both geography and time, indicate a constitutional structure which is, in a very specific sense, "complex." Monarchic, oligarchic, and democratic tendencies exist side by side without open contention. In spite of the drastically unequal importance of the members, the community forms an organic unity. This was clearly the case in the primitive church as well, although the hierarchic stratification of the various members is much more strongly expressed in our Jewish documents. He who wants to appeal to the New Testament in matters of contemporary church order may take notice of the fact that, in a Jewish movement slightly older than Christianity or contemporary with it, monarchic, oligarchic, and democratic tendencies could work together in organic unity. And yet its members were not nearly so closely united as the brothers in Christ were soon to feel themselves.<sup>11</sup>

But the organization of Jewish religious communities as reflected in the Qumran documents was not the only factor in this shift of emphasis from Spirit to organization. Not only were the converts from the Gentile cults being transformed into the image of Christ, but they in turn brought with them ideas and usages from their ancestral religions which could be assimilated by the growing body of Christ, provided they were not incompatible with its own life-principle. These Gentile cults had rules and officers, too, so that those who came into Christianity from these cults would look to the Christian counterparts of these officials to perform similar functions. On the one hand they were not altogether unprepared to submit to control and to take directions from the leaders of the church; but on the other hand, as we see from I Clement and Ignatius, they were also inclined to be independent both in thought and in action, so that the type of discipline represented by the Qumran Manual could not have been imposed on them without undergoing modification in the process.

We shall now examine a number of Greek words for service and Greek titles

10 *Interpreter's Bible*, X, p. 260.

11 "The Constitution of the Church," in Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York, 1957), pp. 143-156.

of officers that came into the New Testament, bearing significant content capable of enriching the corresponding Jewish terms.

In the Greek New Testament the idea of service is expressed by several words which are not sharply distinguished but which have different associations and shades of meaning. A brief consideration of their use will throw further light on the inclusiveness and spirit of *diakoneo* and on what would be expected of church officials, whatever their office and title. They are *douleuo*, *therapeuo*, *latreuo*, *leiturgeo*, and *hupereteo*.

*Douleuo* means to serve as bondman and slave. The emphasis is on the service and on the subjection of the servant to the master who owns him.

*Therapeuo* emphasizes the willingness of the servant to serve and the reverent care with which he serves. For this reason the word is especially fitted to express service to God; it is often used with reference to the care and healing of the sick.

*Latreuo* is to serve for pay. In the New Testament period the word was used mainly of fulfilling religious and cult duties.

*Leiturgeo* designates official public service rendered to the people and to the state. In the Septuagint it is used of the temple service, in Christianity of service to the church.

*Hupereteo* has the basic meaning "to row." When used in reference to serving it expresses especially the relation of the servant to the person he serves. In Xenophon *huperetes* means "adjutant."

As compared with all these verbs of service, *diakoneo* has that special shade of meaning which designates the wholly personal service rendered by one person to another. Thus it is most closely related to *hupereteo*, but it is nearer to the concept of service motivated by love.<sup>12</sup> For this reason, and because of its inclusiveness, *diakoneo* was the best of all the service words to furnish the name for an office in the church and the title for the person who holds the office, whether that person be man or woman. In fact, *diakonos* comes much closer to expressing the genius of Christianity than *episkopos*, with which it stands coupled in our earliest references—for example, Phil. 1:1, "To all the saints in Christ Jesus who are at Philippi, with the bishops (*episkopois*) and deacons (*diakonois*)."

As the episcopacy developed, the presbyters and the deacons took a subordinate position. Since the *diakonos* then ranked lowest, the diaconate would more readily be open to women. But the New Testament has little to say about a female diaconate, and what it does say (Rom. 16:1; I Tim. 3:11) leaves the matter far from clear. The development of the work of deaconesses is conveniently summarized by Oepke.<sup>13</sup>

The loosest form of organization is the division of the congregation into age-groups which is apparently recommended in Tit. 2:2 ff., where it is made the duty of the older women to

12 Hermann W. Beyer, in Kittel, *op. cit.*, II, p. 81.

13 In Kittel, *op. cit.*, I, 788-790.

admonish the younger women to live a Christian family life. I Tim. 3:11 points to official women deacons on whom requirements similar to those demanded of men are laid: "The women likewise must be serious, etc." This is also the interpretation of W. Brandt, *Dienst und Dienen im NT*, 1931, p. 177. The reasons against interpreting this passage to mean the wives of deacons are convincingly brought together by G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit*, I, 1882, p. 396 f. On this passage Dibelius, in his commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, does not venture a decision, but inclines to the rejected interpretation. Certainly their activity in supporting the bishop or presbyter is not limited to works of charity but is also of a more administrative, perhaps even of a pastoral, kind, especially, as is probable, service to women. Nothing is said about their family relationships. This is in favor of the view that it is a question of independent females who are no longer young and who devote themselves wholly to the service of the congregation.

The relation of the women in I Tim. 3:11 to the widows in I Tim. 5:3 ff. makes difficulties for the interpreter. Certainly the latter are recipients of church support (verses 4, 16). It is quite generally assumed that they had to render charitable and pastoral service in return. But this assumption is not to be derived with certainty from the text, for verse 10 does not speak of the future task of the widows on the list, but of their worthiness, which is also conditioned by freely practicing works of mercy. And verse 13 hardly deals with pastoral visits to homes, but in general with the wanton and talkative curiosity and busybody activities of widows who want to marry again and from whom the care and support of the congregation is withdrawn. But the position of the widows who are kept on the roll is honorable throughout. Even though, because of their age (verse 9), they were not capable of physical work, such as nursing the sick, they were nevertheless good persons to employ for the tasks that are outlined in Tit. 2:3 ff. The further development of the institution of widows also points to the conclusion that their work may have been semi-pastoral. . . .

Pliny the younger (Ep. 96) mentions Christian *ancillae* who are called "ministers" (*dia-konoi*). In Rome, Grapte, who is probably herself a "widow," is told to admonish the widows and orphans by reading to them the Visions of Hermas (Herm. V, 2, 4, 3). Quite early, also, "virgins" were made members of the widows' group (Ignatius, Smyr., 13, 1); and according to Tertullian they included even those who were under twenty (Virg. Vel., 9). Everywhere in the West, including Egypt, these "widows" were mentioned in connection with the officers of the congregations, but they received no ordination through the laying on of hands, and they ranked beneath bishop, presbyter, and deacon.

In the East, on the other hand, the female diaconate continued. According to the Syrian Didascalia (14.15), the organization of widows included all the widows over fifty. But they had very modest functions, and essentially their group consisted rather of the women of the congregation who were poor. The women officers were called deaconesses. There is a difference of opinion whether in this case it was a matter of only a difference in terminology or of a new institution which originated among ascetic circles of married women.

The longer the lapse of time, the more the work of the female clergy was limited to taking certain prescribed parts of the church service, to assisting at the baptism of women, visiting women in their homes, providing the elements of the Lord's Supper, etc. Real sacral functions, which occasionally were urgently desired by women, were not granted to them. (The Arabic tradition of the Canons of the Apostles does mention female readers of the Scripture.) Not even the right to baptize in cases of imminent danger of death can be shown with certainty to have been granted to women in the ancient church. Tertullian (Bapt., 17) definitely refused it to them. In the West, as also in the East, the regulations against the priestly function of women became ever more stringent. In the course of time the history of the service of women in the church ended in the cloister, where, in the early Middle Ages, the abbesses bore the title of "deaconess."

## III. THE STATUS OF WOMEN WORKERS IN THE CHURCH TODAY

Our study has shown that women workers took an essential part in the work of the Christian church throughout the New Testament period. Their service was a fact, and it was rendered despite the lack of official status that would have placed them on a par with men. The logical consequence of equality before God which is inherent in Paul's conception of salvation by God's grace alone through faith in Christ was not applied to remove the traditional restrictions on the freedom of women. Paul's regulations in I Cor. 11 and 14 may well have been justified by the prevailing social and moral conditions in the city of Corinth; but it is safe to say that they also represented Paul's own personal preference. Paul's successors, who appealed to his authority as an apostle, were equally if not more strict. Meanwhile the growth of the monarchical episcopate was reducing even the male diocese to a subordinate position. This made it even more difficult for women to gain status equal to men, even though their work was in many cases equivalent to the service rendered by men. Still, whether they were recognized officially or not, the women kept on doing essential work for the church, as they have been doing ever since.

This very fact raises the question of how much more might have been accomplished for the kingdom of God if the church had granted to women in practice the equal status which they had in theory in accordance with Paul's declaration in Galatians 3:28. Looking back over the history of the church one can see that much has been lost because of the still persistent constriction on the role of women in the church. But the situation has been changing slowly, and is changing more rapidly today. We need not fear this process of change, for change is inherent in every phase of human existence, and there are things that ought to change, the sooner the better. Homesick longing for hypothetical "good old days" is futile; the sane course is to set about making the new days better than the old times ever were.

In order to prepare for and to facilitate this change instead of resisting it, we need to ask ourselves to what extent the still existing restrictions on the status of women workers in the church represent doctrinal renderings of the class prejudices of the urban cultures of the distant past. Studied in the light of this question, the church's hesitancy to give equal status to women workers appears to be at least in part the result of persistent attitudes and customs which are as dated as drinking from a common cup and as eating with one's fingers instead of using knives and forks and spoons and many another item of etiquette approved by the (masculine) Emily Posts of the first century A.D. By way of summarizing and bringing the historical data to bear upon the problem of what should be the status of full-time women workers in the church today, we shall list some of the attitudes that have long since been made obsolete by Paul's statement in Gal. 3:28 but which are still blocking its solution.

The ghost of Jesus ben Sirach composing his contradictory proverbs about women is still with us. On the one hand, he recognizes that "where there is no wife, a man will wander about and groan" (36:25), and that the grace of a wife 'delights her husband, and her knowledge fattens his bones' (26:13). On the other hand, he says that "to have a daughter is a disadvantage" (21:3), and that "a daughter is a secret cause of sleeplessness to her father" (42:9). And while a wife with mercy and meekness on her lips is "a pillar of support" (36:24), he wants her to be silent and modest (26:14-15), and he says that "sin began with a woman, and because of her we all die" (25:24). Advising fathers to keep a close watch over a headstrong daughter, he says:

And do not sit among women,  
 For as a moth comes out of clothing,  
 A woman's wickedness comes from a woman.  
 A man's wickedness is better than a beneficent woman,  
 Or a woman that disgraces you shamefully (42:11-14, Goodspeed trans.)

Sirach's theologically oriented, double-standard prejudice in favor of the masculine brand of wickedness is of a piece with the ancient prayer of man's thanksgiving that God had created him as a man and not as a woman. The same complacent male superiority appears in Philo's allocation of *mind* to man and of the *senses* to woman. Philo's allegory and Paul's utterly unconvincing argument in support of his ideas of women's hats and hair-do's both appeal to the Scriptures for authentication, just as our own forefathers appealed to the Scriptures in justification of their formula to put woman in her place, "Kinder, Küche und Kirche," her place in the church being understood in the sense of "Mulier taceat in ecclesia." In our mid-twentieth century, these ideas and customs encounter practical difficulties no less formidable than would the practice of confining women to their own quarters and of having them leave the house as infrequently as possible, which is described by Philo. These are some of the things that not only have changed and are changing but that ought to change. They would be hindrance enough even if Christian salvation were only a matter of rescuing God's chosen people for a life after death; they are even more of a roadblock when the task of the church is conceived as including also the establishment of a kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven.

Nevertheless, these restrictions on position of women workers in the church do stand in the canon of Holy Scripture, specifically in I Cor. 11:2-16, 14:33-36, and I Tim. 2:8-15. It is therefore argued that to give women an office of equal standing with men would break the Scriptures and be false to the Gospel which is revealed in it. The issue is very much alive today, as we see in the situation of the Church of Sweden, where the proposal of the government that women be

ordained to the ministry is being opposed by many of the clergy, and in our own country where we are faced with a growing shortage of pastors. How shall we deal with it?

In the first place, one may suggest that it will not help the argument of those who think that the church ought to ordain women to say that the uncompromising restriction in I Tim. 2:11-12, "Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent," can be disposed of by using the critic's knife and saying that the Pastoral Epistles were not written by Paul. For although the internal evidence of these Epistles, as well as the external evidence, when studied in comparison with Paul's undisputed letters, is best satisfied by the hypothesis of their post-Pauline authorship, this conclusion does not touch the point at issue because Paul in I Corinthians has said the same thing, and because I and II Timothy and Titus also stand in the canon of authoritative Scripture which we accept as our standard of faith and practice.

Moreover, the truth of any statement in the Bible and its relevance to our situation today must be judged on the basis of its own intrinsic nature. A thing may be true even if Jesus, or Peter, or Paul, or any other of the writers of the Bible did not say it. The Bible does not contain everything that is true about God's universe and men's relation to it and to him and to one another. There are countless questions concerning which the Scriptures are silent, simply because they did not come within the purpose and purview of their writers and first readers. On the other hand, there are ideas and customs reflected in the Bible that have been transcended in the light of subsequent developments and fuller revelation through the Holy Spirit. Paul himself recognized that his present knowledge was going to be superseded by the fuller knowledge he would have when that which is perfect should come (I Cor. 13:8-12), and the writer of the Gospel of John has made the concept of continuous, ongoing, unfinished revelation the warrant for his own presentation of Jesus as the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:12-14; 16:12-15). If, therefore, we believe, as we do believe, that the Holy Spirit resides in his church and is guiding its members into all the truth, we are free to consider on their merits all the proposals to solve the problems that arise in our own changed and changing situation in a culture which in so many respects is quite different from the human social environment of the men who wrote our Bible. Only we must see that we do it in the spirit of love that builds up and unites the church.

Church history shows the extent to which this has already been done. Women do teach in our church schools and they do write textbooks for our graded series of lessons. Yet the writer of I Tim. 2:12 would call this a breaking of the Scripture, and if we were to follow the literal interpretation which is required to represent what he meant when he wrote it, we should have to forbid them to teach not only in our church schools but even in our public schools. The tortured

exegesis of this and of similar passages of the Bible to escape this reduction to absurdity and to prove that permitting women to *teach* is not contrary to Scripture but that ordaining them to the ministry to *preach* would be doing so, shows how far we have come from the social customs of the first century to which I Cor. 14:33-36 and I Tim. 2:8-15 are addressed. But we still have a long distance to go. It will be hard to get the question of ordaining women to the Christian ministry considered on its own merits as long as Christians permit themselves to be intimidated by a possible charge of disloyalty to the Scriptures if they favor it. The question is whether this is not the very thing that will have to be done not only to meet certain growing needs which women are best fitted to care for, but also to give our full-time women workers in the church a status which will be equal to that of men in its educational requirements, its duties, its dignity, and its compensation.

What has been said is not to be understood as ignoring the physical differences between the sexes and the special functions and responsibilities for each which these differences entail. But today there are many things which used to be exclusively in the province of men but which women are now doing with equal competence, while men are now doing many things that used to be counted solely as woman's work. There are situations and circumstances, both at home and abroad, in which an ordained woman could do work that an ordained man could not do as well or even at all. There are many women, who, after their children are grown and have left home, could give years of full-time service to the church if they were prepared for it. In this respect the situation of women church workers is no different from that of women teachers in our public schools, or of nurses or members of other professions that are open to women.

Judging from the work of the comparatively few ordained women today, one wonders how much the progress of the kingdom of God has been retarded and how much our theological thinking and doctrinal development have been impoverished by these restrictions on the work of women in the church.

A quarter of a century ago when the proposal to elect women to church councils and as delegates to synods was under debate in the United Lutheran Church, those who opposed it sought scriptural support for their objections by appealing to these same passages in I Corinthians and the Pastoral Epistles. Their objections were overruled, and the privilege to serve in these offices was granted to women. But partly because of inhibitions due to psychological factors arising from immemorial social customs, the women themselves were slow to avail themselves of it. So, too, it might be if the right to ordination were granted to them. But in view of the need for more pastors, these difficulties need to be overcome without further delay, and there is all the more reason why this issue should not be complicated any longer by a sincere but mistaken conception of the nature and use of Scripture which only results in using the Bible to block progress.

A right use of Scripture requires that we distinguish the permanent from the passing. For our criterion we can do no better than to adopt and extend the principle stated by Paul in I Cor. 13:13, which he employed to solve the problems of the Corinthian church in his day. The love (*agape*) which never fails suggested to him certain restraints in deference to the prevailing social customs and moral conditions. Today this same love may require us to transcend these restrictions. Indeed, if we do not follow its prompting, we may falsify the very spirit of love which determined Paul's solutions for his day.

As we study the history of the church, we can see the harmful effects of trying to retain unessentials that can and ought to change with the evolution of human life. We can see also the mistake of trying to justify this effort to maintain certain obsolete ideas and customs solely on the ground that they happen to be in the Bible and that to give them up would be to break the Scripture. At the very least, the resulting artificial tension between the old and the new interferes with progress, and at worst its very impracticality breeds hypocrisy. In fairness and in the spirit of love, we should recognize the sincerity of those who think that making the status of women workers in the church equal to that of men would be disloyal to the Scriptures. But then they, too, ought to grant the sincerity of those who think it would not. Always one must guard against the temptation to appeal to Scripture as sanction for positions which may actually rest on prejudices that spring from the culture and social customs in which one has been brought up.

As long as we remain true to the genius of Christianity as set forth in the Bible, we need not fear that we are being disloyal to the Scriptures when we, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, move beyond the unessentials that are obsolete and irrelevant to life today. The genius of the Christian religion is faith, hope, and love, and the requirement for its practice is stated in Mark 10:42-45, "And Jesus called them to him and said, 'You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant (*diakonos*), and whoever would be first among you must be slave (*doulos*) of all. For the Son of man came not to be served (*diakonetheisai*) but to serve (*diakonesai*), and to give his life as a ransom for many.'"

With this passage we must compare Mark 9:35; Luke 22:24-27; Matt. 20:24-28; 23:11; Phil. 2:1-11; Gal. 6:2, 5; and, for the transposition of this theme into the Johannine key, John 12:20-26, where the glory of God as Creator is manifested supremely in the creative service which is symbolized by the grain of wheat that "dies" in the process of multiplying. This is the creative function of each and every Christian, of women as well as of men. In discharging it, "there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28).

This oneness of status requires the "office" for women workers in the church

be rated equal to that of men. In the light of the study which we have made, it is clear that the best of the scriptural names for such an office would be the one that derives from the inclusive verb *diakoneo*, which best expresses the essential character of the Christian faith. But we have to reckon with the fact that the office and title of "deaconess" have never taken hold in Protestant churches in America. Full realization of the inclusive service of the female diaconate has been hindered by the extraneous issues of celibacy and distinctive garb, which in the past have tended to limit its appeal to only a few of the young women who were considering their life-work. Even today, "deaconess" suggests primarily the work of nursing the sick and caring for the poor, leaving out of consideration most of the other areas of service which are implied in the New Testament use of the verb *diakoneo*.

Although recent years have brought gratifying progress in raising the educational standards for deaconesses, we still have to cope with the traditional attitude that has made the study and development of theology and doctrine mainly, if not altogether, an affair of men. But the scope of the task which Jesus has assigned to each and every member of his church, whether man or woman, needs to be constantly extended in order to render the increasing variety of services that are called for not only by the needs of the present day but also by the wide range of meanings in the New Testament use of *diakoneo* and *diakonos*. Taken in the sense of the inclusive meaning of the word from which it comes "deaconess" would be most capable of designating the office which must keep growing with the expanding horizons of the task. But because neither the name nor the office of deaconess has the popular appeal to the rank and file of the membership of our churches which is required for its development to keep pace with the need, it is doubtful whether "deaconess" would be adequate to designate the office of full-time women workers in the church that is now under discussion. The term "minister" would embrace many of the required functions, but it would have to be further defined by specifying minister of *what*; and it, too, would be involved in the issue of the ordination of women, which most of our churches today are still reluctant to grant.

For these reasons it seems impossible to get a single title that will be satisfactory for an office of full-time service by women workers in the church. The best practicable procedure will be to educate them for the particular line of work—for example, teaching, nursing, social work, secretarial—in which they wish to serve and to give them status by means of the usual academic and professional degrees. If all our members could be made to understand the inclusive meaning of the Greek word from which the term "diaconate" is derived, and if this office could be popularized and put on a par with the ministry of men, it would serve admirably. But in view of the state of mind which we have been discussing, it is not likely that this could be done.

The question of a name for the office is, however, of less immediate importance than putting women workers on a plane of equality with men. An important step in this direction would be to admit women to *all* our seminaries as candidates for the degree of bachelor of divinity and then to ordain to the ministry those who may desire and be called to that particular work. Putting women workers thus on an equality with men in the study of theology would go far to develop the *esprit de corps* that is required to cope with our country's anti-intellectual tradition which, in the days before the sputnik, used to delight in poking fun at the "eggheads" but which is now frantic in its demand to train some intellectuals to save the civilization which it has done more than anything else to bring to the brink of disaster.

It will probably be some time before Lutheran synods are willing to ordain women to the ministry; although, in view of the growing shortage of candidates, which is likely to continue under the increasing pressure on high school students to choose their life-work in the physical sciences, the time when this may be done may be nearer than we think. However this may be, the fact is that we shall need to train large numbers of women to serve full time as teachers in our church schools. For this, and for all the other work they will have to do, they need and deserve the same training that is required of men who are candidates for the degree of bachelor of divinity or for other professional degrees. Naturally, equal preparation will carry with it equal status and equal compensation. But in all cases, both for men and for women workers in the church, the essential motivation will be to follow the Master who says, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth."

# Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

## ORDINATION OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH OF SWEDEN?

Since the Church of Sweden is connected with the state, the laws governing its activity are enacted by the national parliament, and its legal affairs are administered by a cabinet minister of church and education. But every fourth year, or oftener, the church holds a Diet composed of elected representatives of the church. Any important new laws or changes in existing laws governing the work of the church must be submitted to this Diet for approval. If the proposed change is rejected, it does not become law.

At a meeting of the Diet in August and September, 1957, the government submitted a proposal, enacted by the parliament, which would have permitted the ordination of women to the ministry of the church. The Diet rejected this change in the law. In doing so it exercised its constitutional authority, but its action has raised a storm of protest, and the matter has become an explosive issue which threatens serious consequences for the church. One of the most important leaders among church women has left the church, and many others may follow. But the problem now involves a great deal more than the question of ordaining women.

The communication from the government had been prepared on the basis of a study conducted by a committee of experts which had been appointed by the government in 1950.

These experts had concluded that no essential religious hindrances exist which would prevent the adoption of a law permitting the ordination of women. The committee included clergymen and theologians, among them at least one New Testament scholar. The report of the experts represented a view that the form of the ministry belongs to the *bene esse* of the church, not to the *esse*, and may therefore be changed and modified so as to conform to the best interests of the church in any given period. The committee noted a number of objections to the proposal: that the order of creation assigns a different function to men and women, that in his ministry, the pastor *represents* Christ, that Jesus chose only men as apostles, and that Paul seems to have forbidden women participation in church services. However, the experts did not find that these objections are valid. Neither the doctrine of the ministry nor the authority of the Scriptures can, according to the experts, be cited against the proposal of the government.

The proposal of the government was referred to a committee of the Diet for study and report. This committee submitted a majority report recommending that the proposed law be rejected on the ground that ordination of women is contrary to the teaching of the Bible. The committee based its argument especially on Paul's words in I Cor. 14, that "women should keep silence in the church." Since Paul de-

clares here, according to the committee's exegesis, that his words are "a commandment of the Lord," this injunction must be valid for all time. Furthermore, his words are based on "the orders of creation" which make women subject to men. Those who defend this exegesis claim that they are faithful to the letter of Scripture.

When this report was submitted to the Diet, it provoked a long and sharp discussion that lasted two full days. That the proposal would be rejected was evident from the start. But there was no agreement on the reasons for rejection. Four resolutions were submitted and voted on. The statement that was finally adopted affirmed that the question of the ordination of women must indeed be answered on the basis of the New Testament, but that there must also be a clear understanding of the nature of the authority of Scripture. In matters of doctrine and questions of salvation the biblical authority is clear and unequivocal, but rules and regulations governing organization and practice in the primitive congregations are not binding on the church for all time. The forms and functions of the office of the ministry belong in this latter category. The Diet is of the opinion, however, that no decision (about the ordination of women) should be made until the church has come to a greater unity and clarity in regard to the nature of the church's ministry and the authority of the Bible. In the meantime some consultations might be held in this matter with the other churches in the World Council.

This is a rather curious statement from several points of view. It seems

rather strange that the Diet of the Church of Sweden declares that it must seek advice from the World Council of Churches. Such an action reveals a certain lack of leadership in the church. It is also strange that the church finds it necessary at this point to confess to a lack of clarity in regard to the office of the ministry and the authority of the Bible. It seems that these questions, which many of us believed settled, suddenly become unsettled as new situations and new problems confront the church.

The committee's report and the subsequent discussion also opened the whole question of the place of women in modern society. Some speakers implied that the biblical order of creation places women permanently under the authority of men and that their place is in the home. Since in the modern, democratic state all positions and professions are open to women and the state no longer differentiates between the sexes, the church comes into a position where it virtually declares that the whole of modern society is contrary to the Bible. It is, of course, embarrassing that the state wants to give women the right of ordination in order to remove this last vestige of discrimination, and the church takes the position of defending this inequality. It is not merely a question of the ordination of women, but a question whether discrimination based on sex can be defended in modern society.

The decision of the Diet has brought four issues before the church at this time: the authority of Scripture, the nature of the ministry, the relation of the church to the state, and the status of women in church and society.

A strong and active fundamentalist group insists that Paul's words in I Cor. 14 must be taken literally and accepted as a legal code valid for all time. They point out that in I Cor. 10, 12, Paul distinguishes between what the Lord says and what he himself says. So also in 7:25 he admits in regard to the unmarried, "I have no command of the Lord." But when he then discusses the women and the ministry, he says that this is "a command of the Lord" (14:37). The Diet rejected this exegesis. It is, of course, questionable whether Paul's words here, "what I am writing to you," would include only the prohibition against women speaking in the church and not the rest of the chapter which deals with ordinances for public worship. Furthermore, the assertion that the Bible contains a system of polity binding upon the church for all time is a Roman Catholic conception which the Reformation repudiated. Luther insisted that the Gospel sets men free and that both the individual and the church have to find the proper forms and means of expressing that freedom. The question then really is: How are we faithful to the Bible? By finding in its rules and regulations which we impose on the church and on individuals as legally binding? Or, by accepting the Gospel of redemption through the blood of Christ and living our life in the church under the guidance of the Spirit according to the circumstances that meet us now in the present? Which of these represent the Lutheran approach?

In regard to the office of the ministry some of the high-church group argue on the basis of the apostolic

succession that the office has been entrusted to men and that women are ineligible. Of course, no women were chosen as apostles. Others would derive the office of the ministry from the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. All are priests, but for the sake of good order the congregation sets aside some who are to administer the office in the church. Although traditionally the office has been filled by men, there is no absolute prohibition against ordaining women. The New Testament is not a code of law which determines the forms of organization and practice for all time. Consequently the church is free to appoint anyone whom the congregation may choose. One speaker closed his remarks in favor of the new law by saying that the appeal to the Bible in this connection reminded him of a scurrilous letter he received while serving as the dean of a cathedral. Said the anonymous writer, "Where in the Bible does it say that we must have deans?"

As the discussion continues, the question of the relationship of the church to the state becomes more and more serious. Already a member of parliament has raised the question by what right a small part of the nation, such as the church Diet, can veto an act passed by the national parliament. Can the state tolerate such a situation? And on the other hand, can the church permit a secular body such as the parliament to decide matters of faith and practice? It would seem that either the state must assume complete control and take away the veto power of the Diet, or else the church must be separated from the state and become independent.

The question of the ordination of women will have to be taken up again, and there is not much doubt as to the final outcome. The action of the Diet was simply a postponement. Ordination of women is permitted in the churches of Denmark, Norway, and in some of the churches in Germany. Several of the large free churches in the United States have ordained women ministers. Whether we approve or disapprove of this practice, it is imperative that we make clear to ourselves the reasons on which we base our decision, and realize clearly the implications involved in such a decision. It was unfortunate that a more thorough discussion of these issues did not precede the action taken by the Church of Sweden.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

#### AMERICAN LUTHERAN CONVERTS TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM

Conversions of Protestants to the Roman Catholic Church often receive a great deal of publicity, and Protestants are sometimes alarmed by what they take to be an irresistible tide toward Rome. Such statistics as are available do not in all respects support the fear. For example, the "Report on the Manifested Life of the Congregation," an unpublished survey of congregations in the United Lutheran Church in America, indicates that during the year 1952 there was a loss of 631 baptized members to the Roman Catholic Church and a gain of 1,948 baptized members from the Roman Catholic Church, intermarriage apparently playing a leading role in the losses and a somewhat lesser role in the gains. Of course, such statistics are to be used with caution, for a parish clergyman is in

a better position to know exactly how many Catholics he receives into his congregation than to count how many Lutherans gradually drift out of it into the Roman Church.

There is abundant evidence that Roman Catholics are not themselves complacent about the picture. A recent article in the professional journal for Catholic priests, *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, Vol. LVII, No. 1 (October, 1957), pp. 60-81, should be of interest in this connection especially because it is concerned with converts from Lutheranism. The author, Paul R. Rust, asserts that those who are devoting their lives to the winning of non-Catholics are agreed that "Lutherans hesitate the longest" and that the percentage of converts from Lutheranism is almost negligible." The author's attempt to explain this on liturgical grounds is exceedingly curious, but his concluding observations are worth quoting.

"Very recently I was told by a young lady converting from the Evangelical Lutheran Church [the author's label for the Missouri Synod] what had almost decided her intention of never departing from her former allegiance. It was the tactlessness of a priest who was instructing an inquiry class. This young lady and another Lutheran girl had registered for the class. The first instruction went off without a single difficulty; so did the second. But for some reason the instructor suddenly decided to be 'funny,' with a tragic result, the temporary loss of two prospective Lutheran converts. He held up for view a large picture of Luther, inviting the class to take a good look

at a big, fat pig. Converts are not made that way!

"Only on rare occasions do we read reports of converts from Lutheranism. . . . We must remember that the average Lutheran minister is a gentleman of education and good breeding; that the bigoted minister is a rarity. . . .

"Allow me, my brother priests, some personal suggestions. When you deal in your convert work with the Lutheran mind, maintain your balance; stick to the historical context of Lutheranism. Within that context fit together your

arguments until they form the pattern of truth and charity. It is suicidal to do otherwise. . . . I earnestly believe that until the leaders of the Lutheran movement today view Luther's theological speculations within the interesting framework of Luther's own mind, his *subconscious* mind, his mind of 1512 in the monastery tower, there remains little hope of any mass conversion of American Lutherans and their reunion with Christ's One Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church."

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

# PAUL AND OMAR

Two who wandered,  
Making tents.  
Two who pondered  
Arguments.

Ranging yet  
In brighter air,  
Have they met,  
The mighty pair?

Paul and Omar,  
What might they—  
Saint and rhymer—  
Find to say?

One sought light  
Forever dim.  
One had sight  
Thrust on him.

On the brow  
Of some far land  
Do they now  
Together stand?

—FRANCES SWARBRICK

# Correspondence and Comment

## ON FAITH AND MEDICINE

To call Dr. Stamm's article on faith and medicine in the *QUARTERLY* for November, 1957, excellent may sound trivial, for here we have a discussion by one who is not only a keen thinker but also a man experienced in the subject he discusses. However, it is the theology underlying Dr. Stamm's argument that disturbs us.

In some ways the article is modern, revealing how well the author has kept abreast of the times, because his plea for cooperation between the physician and the pastor is indeed a relatively new, yet most welcome, sign of our times. In some other respects, however, the article reflects the theology of the twenties. I do not want to say that the author is not informed about more recent trends in theology. Yet it is clear that Dr. Stamm is quite out of sympathy with present-day theology. Like men who were at the pinnacle of their influence in the decade following World War I, Dr. Stamm operates throughout the article with the concepts of "development" and "evolution."

Divine revelation and human discovery have, in his eyes, the identical object (p. 313, final paragraph). What is revelation on the part of God is discovery on the part of man. The promise of Jesus that his disciples shall do greater works than he did during his earthly ministry, Dr. Stamm sees strikingly fulfilled in the work of the medical profession. Divine

revelation therefore includes, according to Dr. Stamm, the whole range of rational truth. This understanding of revelation is strikingly close to that of the Orthodoxist fathers of the seventeenth century with whom Dr. Stamm otherwise has little, if anything, in common. In their eyes, too, revelation includes all data of rational knowledge mentioned in the Bible. This common theological Ansatz notwithstanding, a fundamental difference remains. In the eyes of Dr. Stamm, man's rational powers are the instrument through which God reveals his physical and moral laws to man, while in the teaching of the Orthodoxist fathers revelation is strictly supernatural, God communicating to man facts of history, geography, astronomy, etc., of which man ordinarily has no knowledge whatsoever. Consequently, while Orthodoxism absolutizes every statement of Scripture, Dr. Stamm's method, if consistently carried through, would relativize the whole message of the Bible.

The evolutionary concept also mars Dr. Stamm's understanding of man's sanctification when he writes that "the patient must start to *develop* his heavenly character right now by working with God, who has made man partly responsible for his *evolution* . . ." (p. 303, italics ours). Here, too, the problem of sanctification is expressed in terms borrowed from modern psychology. And the biblical imperative with respect to community

fe is stated in almost identical terms when Dr. Stamm states (p. 303), "He [God] has given man a responsible part in his own evolution." This is still the language of Rauschenbusch, Fosdick, and a host of other American theologians of an age that is past. But the "new theology" is no longer new. In fact, it is out of date, and hopelessly out of date, because it has been weighed in the balances by Scripture and experience and found wanting.

A genuine biblical theology simply cannot follow Dr. Stamm's line of thought. Its view of revelation, as restated in a classical way by Paul Tillich, contradicts Dr. Stamm's concept at every point. Knowledge about diseases and their proper treatment is not a matter of revelation, but of observation, intuition, and conclusion. None of these things concerns us ultimately, as genuine revelation does. What was not known to the medical profession twenty years ago but is known today is not revelation; it is ordinary knowledge which can be communicated in the ordinary rational way. It includes no revelatory element, neither a divine mystery nor faith in God on the part of man (cf. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 1 [1951], pp. 106 ff.).

Finally, this antiquated view is reflected in the way in which Dr. Stamm uses the concept of physical law. To him, as to Spinoza, Hume, and Kant, nature seems to be a closed system. A miracle, i.e., an event not in keeping with the law of nature as we know it today, just cannot occur. Nothing is left to the sufferer, therefore, but to learn, reconcile, and adjust himself, as Spinoza already said, to God's

physical laws; otherwise his prayers remain unanswered (p. 314).

In the background of this argument lurks a belief in the inviolability of causal law. Yet it is precisely this idea of classical physics which of late has been called into question by the new "quantum physics," according to which the law of causality no longer holds exactly, but has gaps. According to Heisenberg and others, matter itself is energy. "It is no longer the case that there is a substratum at rest to which something happens. All that remains is the happening itself. 'The world does not be, it becomes'" (Karl Heim, *The Transformation of the Scientific World View* [1953], p. 39). The single radium atom decides for itself, as some hold, when it will disintegrate. Thus the new "quantum mechanics," to say the least, is an approximation to the biblical understanding of nature. The conflict is not between suffering man and a fixed course of nature. Instead, the miracle stories of the Bible make manifest a conflict between two opposing wills, the will of God and the will of Satan, the "prince of this world." In the New Testament the miracles of Jesus do not stand in opposition to the causal nexus. "Nowhere in Scripture is the causal nexus treated as the antithesis of miracle," as Heim observes (*op. cit.*, p. 189). Rather, a miracle is the mighty act in which the one God challenges the demonic powers which seek to retain their dominion over man through sickness, famine, and destructive storm. In the Bible they are the powers united under one will, seeking to dethrone God and to destroy his creation. But Christ as

the "plenipotentiary of God" had the task of defeating them. This battle was fought in Palestine at the beginning of the Christian era. Yet the war is not over. Although an enemy in retreat, he still fights back. In this struggle the Christian may avail himself of the power of God, through faith and prayer. Of course, a sober, evangelical Christian will not endorse the sentimental exploitation of credulous people as practiced by the so-called "faith-healers." Nor will he, on the other hand, surrender to the inexorability of nature. Christian faith is at all times faith in the living God, the Lord of nature and history.

OTTO W. HEICK

#### OBSERVATIONS ON THE HIGH CHURCH MOVEMENT

After having read the article in the November, 1957, issue of the *QUARTERLY* entitled "The 'High Church Movement' in American Lutheranism," by David L. Scheidt, I should like to make a few observations.

The first observation is that either by intent or perhaps by chance the author seems to assume that "the movement" has or should have "a platform" or that the representatives of it should try to "present their position in a systematic way" (p. 343). The confessional-liturgical revival does not need any special platform or new formulation of doctrine to justify its existence. It is not a new church, a secret sect, or an underground movement. All the foundation it needs is the church's concern for souls, for unity, for greater devotion to our Lord. Actually, the confessional-liturgical revival is pietistic in nature in

that it is concerned for the sanctified life. The fact that it happens to emphasize the sacramental and worship elements in Christianity does not mean that it is concerned with "externals," as is implied in the conclusion (p. 349). Inasmuch as corporate worship and the sacramental life are considered aids in the Christian walk, this movement simply is trying to revive the church through these means. Thus the revival of the church, couched in terms of heightened appreciation of corporate worship and more frequent communing, needs no more a "platform" than any other type of revival within the church. Scripturally and confessionally, the movement is a legitimate one.

The second observation is that in reading the article I personally felt sympathetic with the movement as described by Pastor Scheidt. I have not considered myself in total agreement with some of the emphases expressed by members of the movement, particularly the use of terminology which by unfortunate association seems to be the property of the Roman Church. But I hardly consider the use of this or that set of terms essential to the revival, nor is the idea of celibacy essential to it, nor even episcopacy. As I see it, the essential element in the confessional-liturgical revival is the awakening of the church through corporate worship (and private also!), frequent communion, and solid doctrinal foundations. Others may choose to use words and terms which Pastor Scheidt considers un-Lutheran, but essentially, as I understand it, the movement is what is stated directly above. As a pastor in the Lutheran

church, I receive what my conscience under the discipline of the Scriptures) feels to be legitimate and valuable emphases for the spiritual enrichment of my people from this revival. Perhaps I might not be classified as "a high churchman" because of my reservations, but I thank God that he works through men of different outlooks and inclinations to revive his church. God is not proud and does not limit himself to one particular form of reviving his church; he does not work exclusively through the prayer-group type of meeting, nor does he work only in the Communion service. But he does work in all, so I disagree with the author's conclusion that appears to make the confessional-liturgical revival a thing of dead formalism and institutionalism.

The third comment I wish to make concerns the implications that the Lutheran Church must follow Calvinistic patterns in worship and attitudes toward the church in order to be "an offspring of the Reformation." On p. 344 Scheidt states that members of the society for liturgical revival took the position that better knowledge of the Psalter, more frequent communion, and observance of church festivals would further the spiritual life of the

Christian community. Then he states: "The society saw in the severe criticism and condemnation of its undertaking evidence of an overwhelmingly Protestant disposition of Lutheran clergymen and laymen to believe that the Lutheran Church is an offspring of the Reformation."

The fourth and final observation I would make is that the aim of the article to furnish an objective description of the movement is sadly betrayed by the conclusion of the author in which he states on p. 349, "The concern seems to be for authority and certainty, and these are related to tradition (never clearly defined) and to the external and institutional. Perhaps this accounts for the interest in rites and ceremonies, episcopacy and celibacy, quantitative aspects of devotional practice and fixed formulations of doctrine." If the author must draw conclusions, let him at least draw his conclusions from the expressed purposes and aims of the men in this movement. After examining the quotations which he has supplied the reader with in his article, I feel the conclusion as he has chosen to phrase it sells short the quotations.

CARL BEYERHELM

# Book Reviews and Notices<sup>1</sup>

*The Last Book of the Bible.* By Hanns Lilje. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957. 286 pages. \$4.50.

It is good to have Bishop Lilje's interpretation of the meaning of the Revelation of St. John in such clear, flowing English as Olive Wyon provides. Part I, which provides the background material, might well be read after Part II. The author is obviously anxious to get at the meat of the matter, and not too interested in complicated introductory matters. Considerations of authorship and sources of apocalyptic images are treated somewhat cavalierly. The author would have us see the "visions" as real. It is rather difficult to imagine that genuine visions could be as dramatic, intricate, and logically related as the series in this apocalypse. It seems questionable, too, that Babylonian astronomy and apocalyptic were as popularly current in the first century as would be required if the "forms" of this prophetic message were to be grasped and read aright by the Christians to whom they seem to be addressed.

Once Bishop Lilje gets to the interpretation of the text of Revelation he is at his best. His life experience has enabled him to penetrate the elaborate and intricate images to their spiritual heart. He treats these images not as pictorial but impressionistic (p. 29 f.). He regards the "wealth of color and pictorial detail" as "used only to try to express the inexpressible" (p. 106). He is careful not to destroy the meaning of the successive visions "by a pedestrian explanation of details." To this end he keeps detailed interpretations of individual symbols at a minimum, placing them in brief notes at the end of each section of his dramatic outline. Thus the emphasis and flow of the main thought are kept in clear focus. He is practically helpful in pointing out how much of the comfort and triumph of the apocalypse is conveyed through liturgical song, which

has entered into the continuing worship of the church.

He makes plain, on every page, that the great theme of the book is "Jesus is victor." This note is to be found even in the dark passages. When the Lord speaks sternly to his church or warns in dire images, the very fact that he so addresses men shows that "all is not lost" (p. 102). The related emphases of the drama are expressed in such observations as "The martyrdom of the saints is not described in sensational fashion, but merely referred to, in order to derive comforting meaning. . . . It is more important to be a witness to Christ, as he himself was the Witness, than to penetrate into the mysteries of the last days" (p. 163). The author of the apocalypse, he points out, calls for "obedience to prophetic authority, not feeding one's imagination upon wild speculation" (p. 272). All the truths of this book, unlike those of previous apocalyptic literature, are not to be sealed and preserved for some small, pious circle but proclaimed to the whole world that men may repent and be saved.

The author's somewhat contradictory theory of Scripture gets in the way of his somber spiritual judgment when he comes to discuss chiliasm (pp. 250 ff.). He is unwilling to accept the idea in the literal sense; yet he seems also unwilling to admit that what is presented in this difficult last book of the Bible deals with matters beyond history, not within it. It is inevitable that serious students of Scripture will want to take exception to the details of any interpretation of Revelation. It is just as undeniable that Bishop Lilje has served our generation well by compelling all of us to wrestle conscientiously with the contemporary message of this book. His treatment is a useful and sharp tool to this end.

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER

---

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

*Which Books Belong to the Bible? A Study of the Canon.* By Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 174 pages. \$3.00.

Distinguished as dean and professor of New Testament Literature and History at McCormick Theological Seminary, where he has taught for thirty-five years, the author of this volume raises and answers certain pertinent questions concerning the canon of Scripture. As he has indicated in the preface, he deals not so much with the historical process by which the canon was formed as with the theological issues involved in the setting up of Scripture as a distinctive body of literature in the church.

Among the questions which Dr. Filson raises are these: Why study the canon? What place has the canon today? Is the Old Testament Christian Scripture? Should Scripture include the apocrypha? Is the apostolic witness basic? Is tradition subject to Scripture? To the discussion of each of these questions he devotes a full chapter.

For Protestants, it is noted, the study of the canon has special significance. They rely not on the authority of tradition or the decrees of ecclesiastical councils, but on that of the Bible. Hence it is important to understand and appreciate the literary boundaries of Scripture. The appearance of the Revised Standard Version of the apocrypha in 1957 has aroused fresh interest in the question as to which books belong in the Bible.

After discussing the meaning of the term "canon," Dr. Filson calls attention to certain trends which stand in bold contrast in recent thought. Among these are indifference to Scripture or overzealous biblicism, legalism, or contempt for the written Word, outgrown product or timeless truth, divine dictation or human product, individual judgment or church decision. In discussing these opposing trends Dr. Filson concludes that the canon is determined not by external measurements but by confession of faith. The issue is theological.

The Old Testament, the author argues, is the church's book. While it grew up in Hebrew history, it is a book of prophecy and of promise directing men to Christ, who is its fulfillment. In itself the Old Testament is incomplete. It finds its complement

in the New Testament. This truth of the unity of Scripture the church has grasped and proclaimed. The Bible of Christendom embraces both the Old Testament and the New.

But what about the apocrypha? This question, asserts Dr. Filson, carries considerable confusion today. Generally speaking, the apocrypha represent the excess of the Greek over the Hebrew Bible. There are, however, different traditions regarding the books included. The Septuagint, the Greek Bible, was influential in preserving these works in the church. Luther held the apocrypha as non-canonical yet "good and useful for reading." They appeared in the King James Version of 1611.

According to Dr. Filson, four main theories regarding the apocrypha obtain in the church: (1) The Roman Catholic Church holds them to be canonical and on a par with the Old and New Testaments. (2) The Eastern Orthodox less dogmatically accepts them but without binding dogma. (3) The Anglican rates them higher than works of church leaders. (4) The Reformed churches reject all of these theories, denying to the apocryphal works canonical recognition. This position is in accord with the Hebrew canon in contrast with the Greek, which lacks attestation.

In support of the shorter Hebrew canon is the evidence of our Lord, the New Testament, and the apostolic age in general. Consistency, argues Dr. Filson, requires us to omit the apocrypha not only from our complete Bibles but also from public lectures in the churches. Reading these works in public tends to give them a tone of authority which they do not possess.

For the determination of what constitutes Scripture the apostolic witness is basic. It accepted the Hebrew canon and refrained from using the apocrypha. Gradually, according to the author, the New Testament canon became crystallized and obtained a place beside the Old Testament in public lectures. Many factors led to the formation of the New Testament canon, such as the appearance of spurious works, the rise of the sects, the obscuring of the Gospel, and, above all, the apostolic tradition. By the time of Irenaeus, about A.D. 185, the New

Testament was a reality. Still it required another century to give it fixity as a twenty-seven book unity. Apostolicity was basic in the determination of the books to be included. Still there was considerable elasticity, for several early documents were recognized by churches here and there although they were not the writings of apostles.

Briefly, according to Dean Filson, the tests of canonicity were the church's rule of faith, continuous oral tradition, and liturgical practice. The application of these tests led to the removal of a number of books which were early circulated as inspired documents.

Tradition itself, asserts the author, must undergo severe testing. It dare not be given rank as above or even on a par with Scripture, but it must always be held as subservient to the written Word. The Christian Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the living witness of God and of his Christ. As such they continue to carry unique authority.

Dr. Filson is to be commended for his fresh, scholarly, and readable treatment of the issue. In well-organized form, with choice bibliography, but without any detracting footnotes, he sets forth his thesis in convincing argument. The work will contribute inestimably toward clarifying thought concerning the validity of the true canon of Scripture and its unique place in the confession of the church.

ELMER E. FLACK

*The Gospel from the Mount: A New Translation and Interpretation of Matthew, Chapters 5 to 7.* By John Wick Bowman and Roland W. Tapp. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 189 pages. \$3.75.

As the title indicates, this book interprets the Sermon on the Mount as a gospel and not as a new kind of law. The Sermon is presented as Jesus' portrait of the Christian way of living in the present world rather than as apocalyptic utterances that are irrelevant today and require or permit us to wait for their fulfillment in an eschatological future that may be postponed indefinitely.

Dr. Bowman divides the Sermon into four parts. The first part (5:3-20) deals with

traveling the Christian way; it gives a portrait of the traveler as the image of God out in front in the world, and it concludes with a description of the righteousness of the kingdom of God. The second division (5:21-48) describes this kingdom righteousness with respect to the persons of others and to the other sex, and then goes on to deal with the mind and standard of truth, the will and dedicated humility, and the emotions and God's universalism. In the third section (6:1-34), the kingdom righteousness and true religion are interpreted in terms of utter sincerity, of Jesus' teaching about the nature of prayer, and of utter consecration to the right God. The fourth part of the Sermon (7:1-37) tells how the Christian "becomes that way." It shows man's lack of kingdom righteousness and how that righteousness is attained, making clear God's part and man's part in attaining it. Matt. 4:23-5:2 is treated as the prologue stating the theme of the Sermon, which is the gospel of the kingdom; and 7:28-29 as an epilogue on the effectiveness of Jesus' preaching. Dr. Tapp is largely responsible for the notes as well as for an occasional paragraph in the text itself.

The translation, on the basis of Nestle's 21st edition (1952), is more accurately described as a paraphrase. The method of paraphrase has the advantage of bringing out sharply some particular aspect of the meaning of a Greek or an Aramaic word, as, for example, when *telonai*, "tax collectors," is rendered "collaborationists." But without going back to the Greek or consulting other translations of this term, the reader would not know just what these people were doing to get themselves so hated as especial sinners. A paraphrase can shrink the meaning for the English reader—for instance, when "Blessed are the merciful" becomes "Blessing for those who show mercy"; when "Blessed are the peacemakers" is rendered "Honor to those who bring peace"; and when "Blessed are those who are persecuted" is turned into "God's boon to those who are persecuted." What happens in each of these renderings is that the blessing becomes an object conferred on the Christian from without rather than the inherent inward concomitant of traveling the

Christian way. A similar shrinkage results when Matt. 5:48 becomes "Be adults, then, as your Heavenly Father is of perfect stature."

Here *teleioi esesthe* is translated "be adults," but in the second line the same word *teleios*, "perfect," becomes "of perfect stature." This verse is indeed, as Dr. Bowman says, "a clarion call for ethical maturity," and it does recall the teaching of the Hebrew prophets "that God made man in his own image and that that image alone may serve as the ethical standard of man's maturity." Certainly an adolescent ought to be growing into the maturity of an adult, but "be perfect," which implies this development, is more of a challenge than "be adult"; and "perfect" unmodified by "stature" is required for the infinite God whose image is the ethical standard of man's maturity.

The interpreter of the Sermon on the Mount has to keep in mind two questions: first, what would Matthew's Greek say to a Greek who knew no Aramaic and who had never heard of the Old Testament in either Hebrew or its Greek form, and, second, what Jesus himself, speaking Aramaic, meant to say. The lessons which a Greek would draw from it might be true and valid intrinsically even if they did not coincide in all respects with what Jesus had in mind. The function of the interpreter is therefore not to discard or to depreciate this truth just because *Jesus* may not have included it in the thought which he was expressing in Aramaic, but rather to supplement and enrich what the Greek reader would get out of the Greek in the light of what is now known about the Semitic languages and culture of Jesus' day.

This enrichment is what Dr. Bowman has provided. He maintains that Jesus taught in the form of poetry because poetry is easier to memorize than prose, and he prints his paraphrase so as to exhibit the parallelism which is characteristic of Aramaic poetry; for example,

Our Father in heaven:

Thy name—be it hallowed,  
Thy Kingdom—may it come,  
Thy will—be it done,  
On earth as in heaven.

This indicates that the three petitions are variations upon one theme, which is the prophetic doctrine of the sovereignty of God, and it makes clear the intention of Jesus, which is that the name, the kingdom, and the will of God shall be acknowledged on earth as well as in heaven. The point is of importance for a proper understanding of the nature and location of the kingdom of God.

In comparing the Sermon as given by Matthew with the Sermon as presented by Luke, Dr. Bowman suggests, on the basis of the poetic structure which he finds in it, that Jesus himself may have given the Sermon in different forms and may have compiled it substantially in its Matthean form. As compared with the conclusions drawn by some scholars on the basis of the form-historical method, the result is a more conservative interpretation which attributes less in the Sermon to the creative action of the church between the death of Jesus and the writing of the Gospels than some of our literary-critical treatments of the teaching of Jesus have supposed. A case in point is the exceptive clause in Matt. 5:32, which some interpreters ascribe to the church rather than to Jesus. Concerning it our author says, "In the present context the words in parentheses, 'unless the ground be adultery,' which are well supported by the manuscripts, should certainly be taken to mean that one who is already an adulteress is not made such by divorce. This is merely to say what our homely proverb suggests: That 'one cannot spoil a bad egg.'"

The continuity between Jesus' teaching and the Old Testament is emphasized. Thus with respect to the second stanza of the Beatitudes, as our author divides them, we read, "An observation that greatly helps forward both the interpretation of the second stanza and the solution of the literary problems which it presents is the simple one—overlooked by all the commentators apparently—that its structure and content are derived *in toto* from Ps. 85:10: 'Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.'" The resulting interpretation greatly enriches our understanding of Matt. 5:7-10.

Well-chosen citations from rabbinical lit-

erature illustrate the difference between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees, and they do it in such a way as to avoid the mistake of trying to honor Jesus by depreciating the heritage which he received from his people. Parallels from the Dead Sea Scrolls are brought to bear on the interpretation of Matt. 5:22-23; 6:2-4; and 7:13.

Dr. Bowman keeps it clear that Christians are saved by God's grace alone through faith in Christ and not on the basis of credit claimed for obedience to the Sermon on the Mount conceived as a new law. At the same time his emphasis on the present this-worldly relevance of the Sermon makes equally clear the mistake of seeking release from the tension between what we are and what the Sermon says we ought to be by resting content with an eschatological anticipation ethic which in practice can be just as effective in reducing its teaching to irrelevancy as the interpretation which treats it as an interim ethic. His book, therefore, has something important to say to the eschatological mood which dictated the Theses of the Minneapolis Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in August, 1957.

There are 51 Minneapolis Theses. There ought to be 52, the 52nd to deal with a question left unanswered by the 43rd, which says that the Christian hope "is anticipation of the kingdom, which has drawn near with the gift of the Spirit, the 'down-payment' of our inheritance." The question is, *How* is God going to pay the balance, and what has the Sermon on the Mount to do with the manner of his paying and with our receiving the payment? Thesis 50 declares that "the church has to be cleansed from all that would transform the manifestations of the kingdom into human activities of a society for the preservation and promotion of Christianity as a philosophy, an ideology, or a way of living. It is only in the dimension of hope and with the power of the Spirit that the church can be true to herself and her Lord." This way of stating it has fallen victim to the either-or fallacy, and unless it is corrected it will obscure the fact that in the Sermon on the Mount Christianity is presented as a gospel which is a way of living. This most recent commentary on the

Sermon confronts our Theses with some unfinished business.

RAYMOND T. STAMM

*Bible Commentary: The Gospel According to St. Luke.* By William F. Arndt. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956. 523 pages.

This volume reflects thirty-five years of fruitful study and conservative teaching in the New Testament field at Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis. For the seeker after biblical insight and spiritual stimulation, it is one of the most satisfying works available on the Lukan Gospel.

Dr. Arndt proceeds on the premise of the unique Spirit-givenness of biblical revelation. Hence he can dispose of the usual introductory questions in the comparative brevity of thirty-six pages. Within that treatment he shows thorough acquaintance with the critical scholarship of the past century. But for the most part he limits detailed consideration to matters of recognized relevance and interest for the non-specialist.

There is uncertainty for this reviewer as to just what view Arndt entertained in some minor matters. For example, in considering Luke's sources, on the one hand he emphatically excludes Mark from the "many" writers to whom Luke refers in 1:1 (p. 9). Yet he also states (p. 14) that "he (Mark) furnishes the framework into which Matthew and Luke fit their additional material." This acceptance of the generally recognized Markan priority among the Synoptics does not seem to hold up a little later, when he suggests, "Why should we not hold that Matthew collected the striking utterances of Jesus as early as A.D. 50? Mark's Gospel may well have been written in, or somewhat before, A.D. 60" (p. 22). Perhaps the writer intended to express the uncertainty in his own mind on matters not fully established.

The commentary itself is typically thorough, and its organization is conducive to exegetical study. Dr. Arndt's own translation of the Greek of each paragraph of the Gospel is followed by an interpretation of the section under consideration. This portion, offered in large type, digests the text with-

getting into its technical problems. There then follows, in smaller type, a verse-by-verse analysis which introduces all the riches of grammar and lexicography so abundantly available to the writer. A final, and generally very brief section, considers matters of actual criticism. The whole of this treatment is solid, evangelical, stimulating.

The reader cannot miss the apologetic note which prevails throughout the book—that is, apologetic for traditional orthodoxy. It shows in the writer's occasional oversimplifying of inter-Gospel harmonization problems. It probably is present more subtly in his handling of matters of Gospel chronology. And it is most evident in the terms with which he identifies opposing biblical attitudes—for example, "Bible Christians," "conservative scholars," as opposed to "theetics."

An unfortunate result is that the work all too readily invites the label "fundamentalist." It will be applied in the invidious sense, suggesting non-scientific, dogmatically determined interpretation of the biblical record. We need hardly be reminded, of course, that the "anti-fundamentalist" can be and often is fully as unscientific as the "fundamentalist"—precisely at every point where he allows his preconceptions, of whatever sort, to determine his conclusions.

But what is determinative, scientifically, are not the conclusions themselves but the spirit and method whereby they are reached. Dr. Arndt was not only a beloved teacher and gifted expositor, but a reputable scientific exegete. This commentary on Luke is a fitting monument (together with the Arndt-Engerich Lexicon) to a life devoted to scientific but faith-impelled and Spirit-guided study of the Word.

T. S. LIEFELD

*Essays on Typology.* By G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe. No. 22 of *Studies in Biblical Theology*. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957. Paper, 80 pages. \$1.50.

The *Studies in Biblical Theology* is a series of works in paper covers at moderate price. It provides a means for a continued publication of important monographs in the

field. Top-notch biblical scholars from many countries have contributed to this series of studies. The books are published in England (SCM Press) and in America (Naperville, Ill.) and are available singly or on a subscription basis. The works maintain a high standard and are invaluable for the scholar and earnest pastor.

The present work contains two essays on the typology of Scripture. The first, by G. W. H. Lampe, concerns "The Reasonableness of Typology" and seeks to discuss the principles underlying the use of typology. The second essay is a historical study of how typology was actually used in the Bible and in the patristic period.

Professor Lampe reminds the reader that typology was taken for granted in the pre-critical age, when the unity of both Testaments in Jesus Christ was assumed. Modern critical study broke down this conception of the unity of Scripture and discredited the familiar typological and prophetic patterns of interpretation. Positively, the critical method did point to a real diversity of thought and purpose in the Old Testament literature and showed its relevance to the times when it was being written.

It is well known that there has been a strong reversal of this trend of thought, so that the present time can be called "the post-critical period," and the unity of Scripture is again being recognized. While much has been gained from the critical period, according to the author, its leaders were mistaken in their disparagement of typology, for the New Testament exegete, for one thing, cannot understand the New Testament writers unless he sees the typological methods with which its authors dealt with the Old Testament Scriptures.

That typological methods have led to absurdities in study and preaching is easily illustrated, especially in the patristic period. The author argues, however, that it ought not for this reason be dismissed out of hand. The Old Testament is the literature of a people "whose thought was controlled by a single series of images" and contained a unifying theme in the covenant idea. If now we hold "that Christ is the unifying centre-point . . . deliberately fulfilling the various images presented by that literature, . . . we

can have no objection to a typology which seeks to discover and make explicit the real correspondences in historical events which have been brought about by the recurring rhythm of the divine activity" (p. 29).

The author makes a strong case for the reasonableness of typology and makes a contribution to a discussion of the principles that ought to be observed in a disciplined and valid use of typology. Here he claims only to have brought up the questions involved that they might receive further discussion by scholars.

The second essay, by Woolcombe, deals with "The Biblical and Patristic Development of Typology." Typology must be distinguished from allegorism on the one hand and from the study of the fulfillment of prophecy on the other.

As a method of exegesis typology is defined "as the establishment of historical connexions between certain events, persons, or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons, or things in the New Testament." Typological exegesis is the search for such linkages "within the historical framework of revelation" (pp. 39-41). Allegorism, on the other hand, is the search for a secondary and hidden meaning underlying the primary "meaning of a narrative" (p. 40).

The essayist next discusses the fulfillment of prophecy, showing that it is usually *re-capitulative* and is often accompanied by *signs*. This has a bearing on the origin of typology, for this is to be found in the way the New Testament writers treated the Old Testament prophecies.

There is next a historical sketch of allegorism in Greek writings (Homer, Philo, St. Paul, and patristic literature), paving the way for the author's exposition of biblical typology. Paul and Philo are contrasted. A major point is that typology becomes undisciplined when there is too little respect for history. This was the case in Gnosticism, and also among the Alexandrian fathers. A sober and often valid use of the method is found among the Antiochene fathers, such as Chrysostom, because of their greater respect for the historical value of Scripture. Such a use of typological exegesis, in contrast to the "Hellenistic tradition," confines typology to the historical pattern within the

historical framework of revelation; rejects spurious exegesis; insists that the identity between the type and the antitype must be real and intelligible; and uses it for expressing the consistency of God's redemptive activity in the Old and New Testaments (p. 75). The implication is that such typological exegesis has a rightful place in biblical study.

Both of these essays are excellent contributions to the field and deserve serious study and discussion.

ETHAN MENGERS

*Promise and Fulfillment. The Eschatological Message of Jesus.* By W. G. Kümmel. No. 23 of *Studies in Biblical Theology*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957. 168 pages. \$2.00.

This is a translation, made by Dorothea M. Barton, of the third and revised edition of *Verheissung und Erfüllung* (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich). The revision consists chiefly in bringing the very considerable number of bibliographical references up to date.

The English-reading section of biblical scholarship will no doubt welcome this important work. The discussion of the meaning of Jesus' eschatological message is in full swing. In a chapter packed with careful and detailed exegesis of many passages, especially from the Synoptics, Kümmel draws the conclusion that Jesus looked for a *future* coming of the kingdom. This is, thus, a refutation of the idea of "a realized eschatology." This expected coming of the kingdom is conceived of as *real* (not mythical) and futuristic, separated from the imminent passion and resurrection by a real interval of time. At the same time, contends Kümmel, Jesus expected that this eschatological kingdom was very near at hand and would come in the life-time of some members of his own generation (Mark 9:1 and Matt. 16:28; vide pp. 25-28 *et al.*). In this expectation Jesus was in error (p. 149), and this leads the author to make much of Jesus' saying, "But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13:32; cf. Matt. 24:36 and Acts 1:7). And he concludes that Mark 13:10 (that the gospel must be

reached to the nations before the end) rejects the view of the early church and is not original saying of the Lord.

In Chapter III, "The Presence of the kingdom of God," the author discusses the passages which speak of the kingdom as *already present* during the earthly ministry of Jesus. These passages seem to be in contact with those that look for the kingdom coming in the future. The author believes that Jesus saw in his victory over the devils and in other miracles and Messianic acts at the power of the coming kingdom was now present and working in him. But Kümmel does not think that Jesus saw the kingdom as present in the life of the disciples (p. 126). It was present only in the works of Jesus. Passages about the requirements for admittance to the kingdom (such as becoming like little children) do not refer to a kingdom already present, nor to the church, but they are "a future eschatological matter" (p. 126). Kümmel believes further that Jesus did not think of the kingdom of God developing on earth (i.e., the church), and he therefore seeks to reinterpret the "parables of growth" and other kingdom parables which are commonly understood to refer to the church in the present age. That the kingdom of God was present in Jesus and in his mighty acts, which guarantees the future coming of the kingdom, is for Kümmel a very important conception. The time of the end and the details of eschatology become secondary; the main thing is that man "respond to the divine mission of *that* Jesus who could promise us the reign of God, because it was already being fulfilled in him" (p. 155).

The present review cannot do justice to the scholarly exegesis, the close reasoning, and the earnest pursuit of truth exhibited in the book. The reviewer is not, however, convinced that Jesus knew nothing about a fellowship of believers with one another and with him as forming a church, which in some passages is identified with the kingdom. Nor can he persuade himself that so large a structure of thought can be erected on the tentative ignorance of our Lord.

ETHAN MENGERS

*The Gospel Jesus Preached.* By S. MacLean Gilmour. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957. 238 pages. \$3.75.

Many books suffer from titles that promise too much. The book under review is a case in point. Lured by the title, the reader approaches the book with high anticipation, confident of finding in it a reasonably coherent summary of the "gospel" Jesus preached. He finds, instead, a series of more or less disjointed studies, some of which, though interesting and valuable, contribute little to the over-all theme.

The book opens with four chapters dealing with the records of Jesus' preaching, chiefly the Synoptic Gospels. It then discusses his role as preacher, his gospel of the kingdom in its relation to the church, his teachings on miscellaneous subjects (God, prayer, personal virtues, etc.), his ethical imperatives, the relevance of his ethic, and his words about himself. The book closes with a brief chapter in which the author bears witness to what Christ has meant to him in his life.

No doubt the relative lack of cohesion in the book is due in part to the character of the sources. Honest scholars have long since discovered that they cannot organize the teachings of Jesus into a neatly articulated system. But the book suffers from an additional limitation. We learn from the preface that the first draft "was prepared for delivery over a number of Canadian radio stations at the request of the Radio Committee of the United Church of Canada" and that the studies "were also used later as the basis of a series of lectures to laymen." One suspects that the material was eventually whipped together rather hastily, perhaps to meet a deadline. Although the individual studies often reflect the fluency and freshness of spoken discourse, the internal organization of the book is so casual and haphazard that the reader can hardly escape the tedium of repetition and discursiveness.

The studies flow from the pen of an informed and ready writer, who could produce a first-rate book on the subject. He knows the problems, both exegetical and historical, and seems thoroughly at home in the whole field of New Testament scholarship. Now and then his pages are lighted up with price-

less insights into the meaning and character of individual teachings.

Of special interest as an index of current trends is the author's sturdy emphasis on the "community" aspects of the New Testament. He sees the church almost everywhere. This is in line with the continuing revolt against the older liberal thesis that Jesus never contemplated the founding of a church. It is also an implied rebuke of the traditional thesis that the first Christian Pentecost was the "birthday" of the church.

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

*The Christian Ethos.* By Werner Elert. Translated by Carl J. Schindler. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957. 451 pages. \$6.00.

There are many volumes in contemporary Christian thought which can be readily read, evaluated, and laid aside after having provided a bit of intellectual stimulation for the moment. Such books we prefer not to buy. This is not that sort of book. It is one which may well become a basic reference work in any pastor's library as well as an indispensable text in seminary curricula. It is this quality which makes both for the high value of the volume and for its frustrating limitations.

Werner Elert was one of the most influential and articulate spokesmen in the revival of a distinctively Lutheran theology on the continent of Europe during the first half of this century. He is best known for his comprehensive *Morphologie des Luthertums* and *Der Christliche Glaube*, neither of which, unfortunately, has so far been translated into English. A much earlier and briefer book, *An Outline of Christian Doctrine*, was translated thirty years ago. The present volume, written in 1948, represents one of the last major works of Elert before his death in 1954.

In line with the concern of most contemporary Christian thought, Elert begins with a discussion of the problem of methodology in Christian ethics. One does not simply leap into the midst of things and proceed to describe what a Christian ought to do in order to fulfill the will of God. The task of Christian ethics is rather to examine

and understand the Christian ethos, i.e., the quality of man under divine judgment. While ethics is not a part of dogmatics, such a volume as this may well be described as the construction of a Christian anthropology: what is the essence of man's existence in the light of divine judgment. Ethics begins with God, not man; with divine judgment, not man's attempt to fulfill the divine demand (as typified by Roman and Reformed ethics). Divine judgment, however, appears in two forms: the law which condemns and the gospel which forgives. This basic Lutheran distinction between law and gospel forms the pattern for the methodology of evangelical ethics: the examination of ethos under the law and ethos under grace. To these two aspects of the Christian ethos, which become the first two parts of the book, is added a third consideration under the title of "objective ethos," i.e., the ethos of the Christian community which speaks as a "we" and has a quality of objectivity distinct from the subjective concern with motivation which is typical of the ethos of the individual Christian.

Part I, *Ethos under Law*, describes the nature of man's responsibility as the creature made in the image of God and placed by him within certain conditions of existence wherein man is driven to recognize himself as a sinner (not just one who sins) in rebellion against God's law. The law of God is not confined to the decalogue or other written commandments and prohibitions; it is *nomos* in the broader sense, the order of God. Ethos under law is "nomological existence," life within the realm of God's order, life in relationship with God and the cosmos. In this *nomos* is man's security, for life without it would be chaotic and impossible; but *nomos* is also that which places man's life in constant jeopardy, for it is also the law of retribution. Through it man becomes aware of his rebellion against the order of God's creative and governing activity, not just by what he does but in his very self, the totality of his humanity; and he knows that death is the result of his irresponsibility. *Lex semper accusat*; and in ethos under law man is always under the law of retribution which drives him to Christ. This *nomos* of God is apparent in the orders of existence,

the "states," the "orders of creation," which the decalogue and other laws of Old and New Testaments presuppose. These orders are all good in the sense that they are a part of the configurations of existence in accord with the orderly creativity of God. By means of them, however, man is placed in the situation whereby he can be judged by God. These orders in themselves do not make a man good or bad; they provide the situations in which we prove ourselves good or bad. Here again the law always accuses; there is no escape from the fact that in these existential orders in which we live we fail to act responsibly. Elert's discussion of these natural orders as existential places in which we stand, a product of God's providence, orders that "are" rather than "orders of creation," orders that "ought" to be, should clarify some of the problems in this controversial area of Lutheran theology.

In connection with the discussion of each of these orders Elert turns to relevant problems: the order of the family (parent-child relationships, educational theories, public support of education); marriage (the meaning of marriage, polygamy, divorce); "the people" and the state (capital punishment, foreign policy, forms of states, rebellion, patriotism, citizenship, loyalty, oaths, etc.); economic interdependence (property, labor, fair wages, economic orders); vocation (with particular reference to the dilemma of Luther's doctrine in today's world); as well as the orders of truth, oaths, and honor. These in turn lead to a thorough discussion of sin and guilt, centering in the conviction that our nomological existence is inseparable from the sin, that of acting and living toward God, toward others, and toward ourselves "as if" we were not sinners, "as if" the law of retribution did not apply to us, "as if" we were secure in and by ourselves.

Part II deals with ethos under grace—the transformation of man's existence which is brought about by the encounter with Christ, "the Friend of sinners." This section may well be described as ethical dogmatics—a study of atonement, justification, regeneration, conversion, "reintegration," and Christian freedom in the light of Christian anthropology. Having been made a new creature, the Christian ventures forth in

obedience born of faith. His life, however, is not one of perfection or deliverance from ethos under law; rather, his entire life is lived within "the invisible struggle" between the two ways, the two eras, and the two kingdoms. In this context Elert deals with the "third use of the law" from a distinctively Lutheran point of view, with prayer, and with "the beauty of the world." In the final section the objective ethos as "the Christian totality" is discussed in terms of the "collective 'we'" as evidenced in the confessing martyrs, the worshiping community, and the organized institution of the church. Particularly interesting are the comments on the "anti-communality" of denominationalism and the true unity of the corporate community of the church. This discussion is prefatory to a very incisive historical and theological discussion of the relationship between church and state or "the forces of history."

It is hardly right or possible to evaluate briefly the multiplicity of subjects in so comprehensive a volume as this. By definition the Christian ethos involves all of man's existence under the judgment of God. So the discussion ranges from creation to eschatology, from biology (as connected with the conception of "hereditary sin") to psychology (with respect to the wholeness of Christian personality), from fair wages to liturgics, from capital punishment to "the beauty of the world." In these and many other subjects the author reveals not only the comprehensiveness of the Christian ethos, but at the same time his own comprehensiveness as a scholar. The text abounds in quotations and historical references; and one of the most valuable features of the book is the author's careful and precise delineation of points of view divergent from his own. This is particularly apparent in the frequent references to Luther, Melancthon, and the Lutheran Confessions, as they are contrasted with representatives of Reformed theology and of ethics both in the 16th and the 20th centuries. It is this combination of historical perspective, theological lucidity, and unique methodology which makes this book one of major importance. The fact that it seems too often to be speaking out of the past without specific reference to the present, and that

one would ask many questions and differ often on details—these do not detract from the value of the volume and the place it ought to have as a basic reference. As suggested above, the use of the book will be proved over many months and years, not in a single perusal. My own copy has already become considerably less than new as a result of three months' underlining and frequent reference.

It is, however, the very fact of the importance of this book as a reference work that makes its use so frustrating. The responsibility for this is apparently to be placed not at the door of the author but at the door of the translator and publisher. Admittedly, translation of theological German such as Eiert's is not an easy task; but a good translation ought at least try to communicate the meaning of the original as accurately as possible. Besides some obvious mistranslations, two other factors are major hindrances in the use of the book. In innumerable cases (my own count gave up at 37) the paragraphing is not only confusing but downright misleading. Again, admittedly, this matter confronts the translator with no simple task; but to include three totally different ideas in a single paragraph, for example, and then a few pages later to decimate the sequence and development of a single idea into several paragraphs, is to confuse and confound. This is particularly objectionable in the many instances in which the author presents long analyses of points of view different from his own, but the paragraphing is such that after several readings one is still not sure when the author is presenting his point of view or that of others. Omissions from the original text are apparently a partial cause for this confusion, along with the incorporation of some footnotes into the body of the text.

Related to this problem is the way in which the translation ignores the commonly accepted rules for communication by means of English grammar. The use of commas instead of semicolons, the omission of necessary commas, the lack of use and misuse of the dash, and the occasional substitution of question marks for periods and exclamation points—these and similar practices are inexcusable in a volume such as this.

A second major problem in this edition is the way in which the footnotes and bibliography have been dealt with. In an important reference volume such as this, the omission of scholarly footnotes is a major loss, both as to the source of the materials used as well as the additional explanation and qualification of textual materials that appear in the footnotes of the original. What is left is essentially a listing of biblical verses referred to in the text (a list which might better have been maintained, as in the original, as a separate index) along with references from the Lutheran Confessions. The bibliography is nothing less than ridiculous. The lengthy bibliographies of the original (with their significant dearth of non-Continental sources) were placed at the conclusion of each major section; in this edition they have been completely displaced by a single bibliography of obviously American invention, including many books not referred to in the text and some written after the publication of the original edition and even after the death of the author!

It is to be hoped that any future editions of this work, or translations of other major theological treatises, will avoid some of these frustrating inadequacies so that such a valuable work as this need not be contained in too earthen a vessel.

HERBERT C. WOLF

*Luther on Vocation.* By Gustaf Wingren.  
Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen.  
Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957.  
256 pages. \$3.50.

The author, who is professor of Systematic Theology in the university in Lund, Sweden, indicates that his purpose is to set forth Luther's thinking on one point, *vocatio*, within "the context of his fundamental concepts, law and gospel, the work of Christ, freedom, sin, etc." This he does under the major headings "Earth and Heaven," "God and the Devil," and "Man."

Vocation was to Luther inextricably related to the Christian way of life. It cannot be reduced to secular, sociological, or economic terms but is a specifically religious expression. Everyone has a station in life (German, *Stand*), but only the Christian has

vocation (*Beruf*). Christian vocation is best seen in "faith active in love." The Christian serves God by serving his fellow men in and through his particular station in life. As he does this, he finds his real vocation, which he discharges "out of love for Christ." By doing so he actively participates in "God's own care for human beings." "God's love reaches out to others through Christians as channels." The Christian may find his vocation not only in his occupation but also in the so-called "biological orders," as parent, or spouse, or child. But whatever the station, it is a situation in which man "chooses sides in the combat between God and Satan."

At the same time Luther was also careful to point out that God does not need our good works, nor can man hope to be saved in the strength of good works performed through his vocation. Nothing that man does can lift him from "the condemnation that rests on him before God." Only Christ can do that. Good works belong here on earth, in the realm of law. But while God does not need our good works, our neighbor does, and as long as we live in this world our "powers are to be spent in the service of others."

It is to be regretted that the publishers have omitted the footnotes of the Swedish edition from the translation. Five or even ten more pages would not have made the book too long, and the information contained in the footnotes would be of great value to American scholars.

GENE LUND

*Reality and Prayer.* By John B. Magee. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. 214 pages. \$3.50.

The author of this excellent discussion of prayer is professor of Philosophy and Religion at the College of Puget Sound in Tacoma, Washington. He has served as minister of the University Methodist Temple in Seattle and other churches of other denominations. Leslie D. Weatherhead, who writes the foreword to the book, says, "In my opinion this is a great book. . . I feel proud that a Methodist minister has given twenty years of study, thought, and practice to equipping himself to write such a book. The background knowledge revealed in this book is, to me, staggering."

This reviewer read the book with only minor breaks in time. It is well worth reading in this manner to stir a man's heart and spirit, to make him confess sins in relation to prayer, and to give him promise and hope in his prayer life. The book did this for me. It is also well worth a second reading, and more, with long stops at each chapter. The "twenty years of study" are evident on most of the pages. The author unquestionably reflects much of the doubt, the questioning, the searching, the spiritual hunger which he must have met as he discussed prayer in lectures, sermons, and classroom. There is a kind of breadth to his treatment of the subject that is not attempted, or even understood, by many.

In the second chapter, which Dr. Weatherhead calls "the most valuable essay on the theme I have ever read," the author writes of "Science, Law, and Prayer." He raises the questions: "How can I expect God to answer prayer in a universe ruled by mechanical law?" "Does not our control of nature through science make prayer unnecessary?" "Why should we ask God for the things we can secure for ourselves through intelligent action?" He then proceeds to identify three developments in contemporary science which he believes will contribute to the growth of modern devotion. The first is the emergence of an organismic view of physical reality instead of iron, mechanistic law. The fact that a living law exists rather than a mechanistic one, he says, has a great bearing on prayer. It no longer is a logical absurdity, but a logical probability.

While the book is a valuable and serious contribution to the Christian study of prayer and its reality for man in any age, not least our own, there are at least two great topics which are left untouched. The New Testament makes clear, explicitly and implicitly, that Christian prayer flows to God in the name of Christ, with all that the name and work of Christ implies for the Christian. These pages ignore this issue. With all the profound searching, there is a strange silence about the basis on which a man may dare to stand before his Creator. The reader should be prepared for this and supplement it from his other resources.

The other topic which is notable by its

absence is the answer for the person who has ceased to pray, who knows he ought to pray, and who fails to get off "dead center" just because someone presents the logic and reasonableness and reality of prayer. How does the break-through come? There are answers, of course, but they are not in this book.

Recognizing these limitations, and admitting that no one book can be all things on such a topic, this is a volume to be commended and digested.

RAYMOND M. OLSON

*No Cross No Crown: A Study of the Atonement.* By William J. Wolf. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1957. 256 pages. \$3.00.

Man's present struggle for security is a secularized version of his eternal longing for salvation. On the American religious scene the old-style revivalism is inadequate in that it emphasizes the cross but fails to point up the biblical sense of triumph and high hope. On the other hand, the "success religion" movement does not want "to know the cross but seeks only for crowns" (p. 17). While the renaissance of biblical theology, bringing in its wake a revival of Reformation discoveries, is a wholesome sign, a neglect of the "history of theology" hinders its progress.

In chapters II, III, and IV the author summarizes the biblical teachings on salvation. In early Israelite religion he sees an evolution of the concept of sin, finding redemption in God as expressed by Job, "I know that my redeemer (goel) lives" (Job 19:25). Sin now is more than an individual's transgression against tribal taboo. It is transgression against the righteous will of God. It also has corporate implications, as does salvation in relation to the group (Hebrew *ga'al*). The climax is reached in the Christ of the cross. There is, then, in the mind of the Old Testament prophet not only a sense of punishment but also of deliverance.

In the Gospel portrait of Christ we see "salvation personalized when both the words and acts of Jesus are grasped as the locus of God's salvation" (p. 49). This makes history important to Christianity. Always historical research must be imperative to living,

Christian theology. Too often, states our author, an unnatural divorce is created between "the Jesus of history" and "the Christ of faith." A recovery of the category of revelation is the promising remedy. "Revelation is understood as the intimate conjunction of event and believing interpretation" (p. 53). The author here rightly criticizes Bultmann for cutting the roots of Christianity. On the other hand, the author justly warns against the subtleties spun by theologians in connection with the *ordo salutis*. Over against these Jesus' teachings on forgiveness seem to be very simple. Whatever term might be used to tell the story of the cross, the fact is that here is revealed a new insight into the Father-Son relation, so that Paul could say, "Therefore if any man is in Christ he is a new creation" (II Cor. 5:17). In this Father-Son relation forgiveness of sin is guaranteed on the cross. It is more than rabbinic logic. This martyrdom of sacrificial love is transfigured into a new creation of triumphant love through the resurrection. In further unfolding this line of thought Dr. Wolf points out why it is significant that the Risen One became known at Emmaus through the breaking of bread, thus pointing to the future importance of the eucharist.

The focus of history changes as Jesus brings to realization the implications of the figure of the "servant" in Isaiah. "Both the teaching of Jesus and the preaching of the early church keep the saving person and the saving community in intimate association" (p. 79).

Paul, according to the author, relates the work of Christ properly to time. The victory over all that oppresses man is described in Paul in a twofold relationship to time. It is a present possession of the faithful by virtue of a past act in history (the Cross) and in anticipation of a final victory in the future (the Second Coming). Here is emphasized the necessity of placing the atonement within the proper eschatological framework, maintaining a balanced sense of God's holiness and love. Jesus Christ does what none of us could do alone (therefore vicarious and substitutionary), but he does this in order that we may be included in a response of faith-union with him.

The author reviews and evaluates critically, but sympathetically, the different theories of the atonement, covering Greek, Latin, and post-Reformation doctrines. Dr. Wolf reminds his readers that there is no conciliar pronouncement on the atonement. Aulén is commended for having recovered some of the distinct patristic insights, but is criticized for seriously distorting the case by stressing the *Christus Victor* theme as the dominant one in both the fathers and the New Testament (p. 100). Some would not agree with the author in his further analysis of Aulén's theory when he accuses him of over-stressing the atonement as God's continuous divine work. In one sense this is, as the author implies in Chapters VII, VIII and IX, God's continuous work. This reviewer feels that Aulén would not disagree with the author when the latter observes that the atonement was wrought through "the God-man in all the mystery of his twofold nature" (p. 103).

The nebulousness of the Greek theories is replaced by the logical demonstration theories of Anselm and others. The true key to this the author finds, not in the feudal system, but in the rationalization of the element of "satisfaction" in the confessional. Developing this to its most extreme conclusion, "Anselm develops the logic behind the necessity for satisfaction, conflates the sacrificial metaphor with one of the technical terms in penance . . ." (p. 105).

Among Protestants, reactions to this theory varied, but generally Protestant scholasticism emphasized the "propitiation" idea rather than the debt concept. Today many Protestant scholars are returning to the biblical concept of "expiation," pointing up the fact that the consequences of both sin and punishment are borne by God in Christ. English writers, the author contends, have given new emphasis to the significance of sacrifice in the atonement.

In Chapters VIII, IX and X, Dr. Wolf makes his finest contribution in this study of the atonement as he relates it to time. The atonement is first of all an "act of God" which redeems the past since the atonement delivers from guilt. Here God meets man's need. This, the author emphasizes, is the New Testament message, whose images must be preserved. They are meant to illustrate

and describe that saving event and not to be replaced by achieving independent structural existence (p. 135). In this connection Dr. Wolf also brings in an intelligent discussion of sin, the fall, total depravity, the guilt of original sin, etc.

Atonement next means redemption of the present as God works upon a person, working redemption in man, justifying or making man righteous. Involved in all this is the "therapy of forgiveness." "By the power of God's love actualized in the cross and shed abroad in men's hearts by the Holy Spirit, man is freed from self-concern to love God" (p. 158).

Finally the atonement means redemption of the future through sanctification. "Christ conquers sin by leading men on through forgiveness to holiness" (p. 163). In contemporary theology this has led to a re-orientation in eschatological thinking. The accomplishments of the Cross are more than restoration to the status quo ante. "Homo sapiens is destined by God's power to become a new creation" (p. 169). The future event of eternal life rests back upon the past event of Christ's resurrection. This finds expression in the present reality of communion with the risen Christ in his body, the church, and the assurance of his return.

The author also deals briefly but illuminatingly with the redemption of the body and of all nature. The new heaven and the new earth fit into the total picture of the atonement. He finds a new place for the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's ascended body, a doctrine, Dr. Wolf holds, which Luther borrowed from scholasticism to expound the meaning of Christ's presence in the sacrament.

The author rightly warns against sentimentalizing the love expressed in God's atoning act. This is no soft, amoral, immoral indulgence of his spoiled children. It is the element of suffering, the cost on the Cross "that rescues God's love from the charge of playing fast and loose with justice" (p. 195).

From the vantage point of the Cross Dr. Wolf surveys the whole problem of the atonement. In so doing he relates the doctrine to many other aspects, such as the Trinity, sin, guilt, total depravity, etc. This is all done in an intelligent and sympathetic way with a deep and delicate sense of theological

values. No one who wishes to be well-informed on the total problem of the atonement can let this volume go unread.

JAMES J. RAUN

*Religion and the Christian Faith.* By Hendrik Kraemer. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 461 pages. \$6.00.

A new book by Dr. Kraemer wakes expectations beyond the ordinary, for the author of the missionary classic *The Christian Message in the Non-Christian World* created a world-wide interest in his subject. The present book does not disappoint such expectations. The book is really several books in one. While its main subject is that of missions, it roams over a vast area of religions, theology, and missionary approach, and the reader is led through this field by a competent guide. The critical evaluations offered often seem polemical, but the author with masterly skill pilots the reader through the complicated avenues of appraisal of various writers and systems.

The entire book is of great importance to missionaries, but Chapters XXII, "Inter-Religious Cooperation and Tolerance," and XXIV and XXV, "Syncretism as a Problem for Religion," are especially enlightening. The discussion of syncretism is masterly.

In Chapters XXVI and XXVII the relation of religion, revelation, and philosophy is dealt with, and Paul Tillich's teaching, especially on reconciliation, is carefully examined and given a searching but, in this reviewer's opinion, fair critique. "Philosophy is not a vestibule for revelation, and we cannot climb to God via philosophical systems or speculation, although philosophy has its place in cultural creativity. . . . Philosophy is on the one hand actually closely akin to religion, and religiously activated, but on the other hand it is also, virtually, a-religious . . ." (p. 448).

JOHN E. GRONLI

*Theology Between Yesterday and Tomorrow.*

By Joseph L. Hromadka. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 106 pages. \$2.75.

These lectures were given in Toronto in 1956 by the well known theologian of Prague.

The author has a special interest for American students of theology, many of whom came under his winsome influence at Princeton Seminary during and after the war years. Presently a member of the World Council's central committee, Prof. Hromadka arouses both deep affection and grave misgivings.

The lectures are important in three respects. They ask us to probe the core and task of Christian theology. They plead that there be no Iron Curtain for Christians as they seek to engage East and West in dialogue. And they give expression to the faith and heart of a Christian personality. This reviewer believes that they succeed much better in the first and third respects than in the second.

No one can question the author's insistence that theology and church exist to bear relevant and living witness to the incarnate Word of God. Nor will any question that it is all too possible to mistake the voices of our culture for the voice of God. "One of the most urgent and difficult responsibilities of the church has always been to draw a clear, distinctive line between the voice of the living God and various human voices and claims which have penetrated into the very sanctuary of the church" (p. 37). That is why it is so hard to be a real theologian. "A real theologian must stand right on the ground of real, actual human life, of history and its events, and respond to the truth which comes as an inescapable voice from above" (p. 15). Theology can never become abstract, for eternal truth is changeless but not timeless. As the Word became flesh it still meets us in living event and concern.

Well, where are we today? Hromadka is convinced that our so-called Christian civilization has evaporated and that it does not deserve to exist. He pleads that the West take seriously the socialist revolution. (In this, of course, he is not alone, for men like Tillich and Niebuhr have long urged that Christianity seriously confront Marxism.) However, what one misses altogether in Hromadka's discussion is as serious a critique of communist society as that which he levels at non-communist society. To be sure, he indicates the areas where Christians must take issue with Marxist ideology, but

In the main he holds that the failures of communism are due more to Western opposition than to its own inherent illusions. Prof. Hromadka may be right that some in the West have been content with mere anti-communism, but is he not more grievously uncritical in his belief that liberal democracy cannot cope with the present crisis while communist society can? While he admits that communism has made some errors, he immediately qualifies this by insisting that this society is not motivated at bottom by power politics but by genuine concern for the disinherited, that its atheism is not so much atheism as radical humanism, etc. Western democracy has failed its opportunity, he concludes, and communism has appeared not only as the judgment of God but as God's way of speaking "from the very stones." It is evident that this Central European can never forget Munich in 1938. Yet, for all the failings of the West, where does the greater guilt lie? What, for example, of Hungary? (Elsewhere Hromadka has sought to mitigate and excuse the naked might of Russian intervention.) Despite the earnest plea for genuine dialogue, there are not a few pages where this reviewer (who is a grateful student of Hromadka and holds him in affectionate regard) wonders whether this is truly dialogue. Often one seems to hear only monologue.

Be that as it may, the final thrust of the book expresses the Christian faith and warmth of the man himself. "The dividing line runs not between communists and non-communists. It runs between the Lord of glory and mercy, on the one hand, and human sinners (whether communists or non-communists) on the other" (p. 67). And when we think of the future, he says, let us remember that "the day of tomorrow is not in our hands; the day of tomorrow is in his hands—in the hands of the Crucified and Risen. Only if we think of him, if we pray to him, if we put all our expectations upon him, if we forget our privileges, advantages, self-interests, all our human safeguards, only then can we creatively and hopefully work for the church of tomorrow" (pp. 105, 106).

JOHN FREDERICK JANSEN

*Faith, Hope, and Love.* By Emil Brunner. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 79 pages. \$1.50.

Emil Brunner had a problem. More accurately, he had three problems. Since he is a theologian of considerable reputation, these problems were theological problems. At the same time they were and are facts of every Christian's experience. The problems and facts were faith, hope, and love. The problem was "What is the connection of the three concepts—faith, hope, and love—each of which is, in its own right, one of the main words of the Christian message, . . . each of which could claim to be most important?" The problem was complicated by the fact that each one expresses the totality of Christian existence, the totality of "what it means to be a Christian."

The connection between these three concepts, according to the author, is to be found in a basic fact of man's existence as a human being; every man's existence is in the three dimensions of time. He lives in the past, the future, and the present. As Christians, we also live in three dimensions, but in relation to Jesus Christ. The answer that the New Testament gives to the way in which Jesus Christ affects our living in the past, the future, and the present is given precisely in these three words: "we live in the past by faith; we live in the future by hope; we live in the present by love." That is why all are equally essential and total; each expresses the relation to Jesus in a particular dimension of time.

Much of what our author says is "old wine in new wine-skins." Yet there is something new. He is especially interesting when contrasting "progress" and hope and when developing the Christian understanding of "love."

JAMES H. HANSON

*Christianity and World Issues.* By T. B. Maston. New York: Macmillan Company, 1957. 374 pages. \$5.00.

In the opening chapter of this book the author enumerates and evaluates the main traditional views regarding the church's proper relationship to the world and the different notions which have prevailed as to

what the church should aim to do for the world. The church has been, and still is to a large extent, handicapped by its divided character, but it finds itself so strongly challenged by the world today that it can no longer remain aloof from its problems. It is encouraging to note that the church is being more and more awakened to a realization of this fact. A logical question then is: What are the legitimate and most effective strategies? Four strategies are listed and evaluated.

The second chapter deals with the subject of man, a Christian anthropology as the basis of Christian ethics. A perennial problem is that of individual rights as over against the demands of the community, and vice versa. The author points out in some detail that the individual does have rights which must not be violated by the group. But the individual must bear in mind that he also has responsibility to the group. Both the individual citizen and the community must learn to recognize that right and responsibility always stand in tension with each other, that either one is demonic where the other is absent.

The first two chapters have been singled out for special mention because their conclusions are in a large degree in the nature of basic principles upon which the church can exist and work as a responsible agent in the world. The remaining ten chapters deal with the major current socio-ethical problems of which the Christian church must take cognizance and action. One of these is the modern family, beset by pressures which threaten its very existence. There is cause for concern but not for pessimism on the part of the church. Despite its having yielded to entirely too many pressures, the modern family shows signs of vigor and a determination to preserve some of those basic things which belong to the home.

The pressures and tensions of race relations, church-state relations, a radically different economic order, the ascendancy of communism everywhere, and the fact of war and its implications are dealt with in separate chapters.

A fairly consistent outline according to which the author treats a given subject is: a brief reference to the history of thought

on the subject, Bible references to it, and finally what appear to be the logical and necessary view and action on the part of the church. Continually he warns against a too easy and complacent acceptance of that which in the name of modern culture has become necessary. At the same time he tries to show that a too idealistic insistence upon the absolute of the Gospel is self-defeating. The necessity of having to choose a course of action somewhere on this side of the ideal is always painful to the sensitive Christian conscience. But the world and culture being what they are, it is only by this course that we can bear our witness in the area of practical living.

It is the reviewer's opinion that this volume is a good general treatment of some of the major ethical problems confronting the church in our day. It would lend itself well as a handbook in the advanced college class in Christian ethics as well as in the theological seminary.

THEODORE I. JENSEN

*Lutheran Churches of the World.* By Hanns Lilje, Ragnar Askmark, Laszlo Terray, Stewart Herman, E. Theodore Bachmann, Rajah B. Manikam, and Fridtjov Birkeli, with a foreword by Carl E. Lund-Quist. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1957. 333 pages. \$3.50.

This is an excellent book for reference and general reading that will be found to be useful again and again.

It was prepared for the Lutheran World Federation's Third Assembly in Minneapolis as a "contribution to our own churches in helping us understand each other," as Dr. Lund-Quist says in the foreword. It is also a witness to the ecumenical world that the Lutheran Church is also making a sizable contribution to ecumenicity.

The writers are factual and yet not tedious in detail. There is a crisp quality throughout. The relevant material was highly condensed by each author, but the style and movement do not betray it.

This volume is in some sense the successor to the valuable and much used *Lutheran World Almanacs*, published from 1921-1937, and *The Lutheran Churches of the World*

edited by A. R. Wentz for the Second World Assembly). The treatment of the material in the present volume indicates how linking in reference to the Lutheran churches of the world has shifted from consideration of individual bodies to area groupings. The foreword also indicates that there are omissions, namely, Australian and the U.S.S.R.—one omitted because of lack of space, the other for lack of information. This also indicates unfinished tasks in the present phase of Lutheran ecumenical development. Each author describes the present situation in his area in a general manner through a historical review. Each grouping of churches is then described as to its particular developments, problems, and unique features of church life. Each group of churches is seen in the context of rival ideologies or current social and political movements. There are many gripping pages in these descriptions. Suffering and the longings of creative Christian life are not wanting in any area of the Lutheran world. Through it all one sees the transforming power of the Gospel at work.

I read this work twice: once by fragments so one reads an encyclopedia or reference work; once by rapid reading in two sittings. I found that it read equally well in both ways. It can be profitably used for securing information on a special field, ignoring the rest, or as one reads a novel, from cover to cover.

This is the Lutheran-Book-of-the-Year. Every pastor should be certain to get a copy. Shortly it will be out of print and will not be printed again. But a greater imperative to secure it is that one can have in one small volume almost all one needs to know about the Lutheran Churches of the world today to be well informed and understanding.

GEORGE F. HALL

*Luther's Works. Volume 22: Sermons on the Gospel of St. John.* Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1957. 558 pages. \$6.00.

This volume of Luther's works, the fourth of the 55-volume edition currently being issued by Concordia Publishing House and Muhlenberg Press, contains fifty-three ser-

mons on the first four chapters of St. John's gospel. These sermons were preached by Luther between 1537 and 1540, most of them during a two-year period when he served as pastor in Wittenberg while his friend Bugenhagen was in Denmark assisting with the reformation of the church in that country.

Luther was never bothered by "themes" and "topics," nor did neat homiletical outlines get in the way of his preaching. In fact, it is difficult to say whether these discourses would be recognized as "sermons" in congregations today. They are rather expository homilies which accomplish two chief purposes: the detailed explanation of the text and the practical application of its truth in terms of contemporary church life.

Luther explains his convictions regarding the place of the preacher in preaching when he says: "Do not regard the person, but give ear to what is said. Pay no attention to the speaker. See whether it is God who is speaking and acting through his person. If it is God who is speaking, then submit to him" (p. 508). To Luther preaching (and listening to preaching) was at once sublimely simple and awesomely profound. In these sermons, lengthy and often involved, one can sense that here is a man who is unconcerned about what people think of the preacher as long as they will listen to the God of the Scriptures. And when Luther talks about "zeal for Thy house" and the consuming passion of Christ, it is as if he is describing his own attitude toward the grand work of proclaiming the Gospel. I wonder if that is not precisely the strength of Luther the preacher.

These sermons vary considerably in length but are uniform in their exhaustive attention to detail and thorough exposition of the text, verse by verse. Illustrative material abounds, not in modern story style, but in a natural and continuous reference to everyday events and life situations. There is "realism," even in a modern sense, as Luther refers to the earthy smells and tastes and other experiences of life. He is candid in his disapproval of all monkery and "popish" religion but speaks with softness and warmth concerning motherhood, children, and the love of God. Luther's well-known tension between

the "reason" which leads astray and the "reason" which appropriates the Gospel abounds in these sermons. His differentiation between the knowledge which comes through "reason" (law) and the knowledge which results from God's revelation (grace) is simple and direct. Luther fails to understand why everyone cannot see things this way.

For clarity of explanation of the meaning of Scripture in relation to the central truth of God's forgiving grace it is difficult to find a more thorough preacher than Luther. But to read him through to the end requires patience and a kind of attention which is not universal in these days of "digests," "resumes," and twenty-minute messages.

SIDNEY A. RAND

*Sunrise to Eternity. A Study in Jacob Boehme's Life and Thought.* By John Joseph Stoudt. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957. 317 pages. \$5.00.

The shoemaker of Görlitz who, although formally unschooled, made a name for himself as a Protestant mystic and thinker at the beginning of the seventeenth century, is here set before the reader with such light as modern researchers have shed on him. The thought of Boehme is at best difficult to follow, and the author has not always succeeded in providing the uninitiated reader with the tools for understanding. However, this study comes closer to making Boehme intelligible than anything else that is easily accessible.

*The Middle East, Its Religion and Culture.* By Edward J. Jurji. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 159 pages. \$3.00.

The American student of international relations, convinced as he is that nowhere in the world are the applications of power politics more clearly visible than in the Middle East, will read this book with an emotion blended of amusement, admiration, and sympathy. Amusement because Dr. Jurji does not write about petroleum deposits, routes of water, and air transportation, or even about the current polarized balance of

power, but about religion. The great issues of the Middle East, he maintains, "cannot be divorced from their background in the realm of religion," for the key to all the solutions will be found in "the confrontation between Islam, Christianity, and Judaism." Admiration because of the author's profound understanding and remarkable objectivity in appraising the historical developments and present strengths and weaknesses of the three great religious traditions. And sympathy because, as a Syrian-American Christian, he earnestly seeks an understanding among the Jews, Christians, and Moslems of the Middle East that draws upon elements that are universal in nature and common in their religions, and at the same time appeals to American idealism and Protestant Christian initiative in hunting out a common ground on which peace and a creative life might exist.

Most readers, as Americans, will be interested in what the author has to say about the United States in the Middle East. Our failures there as elsewhere, he says, are the product of "diplomatic, cultural, and religious ineptitude." The "three avenues to solidarity" down which we should travel are (1) a diplomacy based on the "revolutionary character of American democracy," (2) "sound cultural contacts implementing the historic American tradition of freedom, equality, and the emancipation of peoples," and (3) a "dynamic religious strategy . . . channeled along the lines of a campaign for peace." As Christians and as members of the human race they will be interested too, in his description of what the world would be like if the "three venerable faiths were to walk shoulder to shoulder" in accordance with a force that "is implicit in the ancient bond that draws Islam, Christianity, and Judaism to each other," and in common recognition that religion is the very reason for the existence of a civilization, not a mere adjunct to it. It is a picture of world peace and of international organizations in which the ultimate resolution of all problems is based "upon the things of the spirit" and "interlocked with the inter-faith pattern."

Dr. Jurji is professor of Islamics and comparative religion at Princeton Theological Seminary and is also an ordained

Presbyterian minister. Because of his scholarly specialty, he is naturally inclined to see in the "comparative religion" approach to political problems a long-neglected and fruitful field. It is unlikely, however, that this book or his other writings will have the slightest influence on current diplomatic negotiations. One can only hope that his and other appeals to religions to cease being sterile orthodoxies and hardened custodians of mutually hostile and irreconcilable viewpoints will have salutary results in the future. What Jurji advocates is not, of course, a starry-eyed soft-pedaling of fundamental differences but a frank recognition that religion, as the cause and reason for civilized life, should be the prime mover in creating conditions favorable to peace everywhere. For any religion of today, to be worthy of its great tradition, must "articulate on the frontiers of existence"; in other words, it must "make foreign affairs, diplomacy, culture, economics, and education its natural frontiers. Either its truth becomes meaningful and vibrant within the contexts of these and other fields of modern life, or religion loses the battle by default."

There is a special lesson in this profoundly moving book for Lutherans of all backgrounds, as we have certainly slighted the ethical content of Christianity and have been tragically insensitive to the need to translate Christian compassion into the language of politics, economics, and sociology.

KENNETH O. BJORK

*Pictorial History of Protestantism.* By Virgilus Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957. 368 pages. \$10.00.

Thirty years ago Professor Ferm published his first book; by this time seven written by him have appeared. Twenty-five years ago he began editing books; of such works—mostly anthologies—this is the thirteenth. Such persistent productivity is noteworthy for an active professor, even in view of sabbatical leaves from Wooster College.

One would expect a professor of Philosophy to prefer his history conceptualized; yet here it comes visualized. On opening the book the reader will notice both pictures and text. Now comes the question, Do the pictures illustrate the text, or does the text

explain the pictures? The fact is that both situations occur.

There is another twofold aspect of the book: the historical and the denominational. The first 165 pages treat of the history of the Reformation, for the most part during the sixteenth century in Europe, but with occasional excursions into later times and to America. The remaining section of almost 200 pages becomes an illustrative treatment of American religious organizations other than Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Jewish. The inclusion of Unitarians, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, and others means that the word "Protestantism" in the title is used with fuzzy outlines. Indeed, the Preface suggests that the "Protestant" is essentially an advocate of freedom of spirit against authoritarianism of any kind.

Almost half of the historical part is devoted to Lutherans (48 pages for Germany and 26 pages for Scandinavia). Lutherans receive ample treatment also in the denominational part, attention being given to the ULCA, Missouri, Wisconsin, Suomi, Augustana, Lutheran Free, Lutheran Brethren, and ALC. The other Lutheran bodies are omitted. Size of membership is no measure of the treatment given. Of course, the major Protestant bodies, and also some very minor ones, are included.

In selecting the pictures the choice in general has been of old ones rather than of recent photography. The result is a very interesting collection of rare pictures of persons and places. The faces of leaders in the formation of American religious bodies are assembled here as in no other single volume. But it must be emphasized that this is an historical collection usually with nostalgic interest rather than a group of new photographs for propagandist purposes. With but few exceptions the pictures have printed clearly and well. The list of picture credits which precedes the index indicates a wide search, not only in familiar works such as that of Oehninger but also in archives.

The text of necessity is brief, presented in generalizations without the qualifications desired by historians. Learned disputes over details had to be ignored. The effort was to be factual and fair. In spite of a few minor errors (e.g., the date of Cranmer's death)

and a transposed picture and title (e.g., University of Uppsala) the final result is excellent. The volume is an important gallery of well chosen pictures of interest both to the casual reader and to the student of history.

W. D. ALLBECK

*Day is Dawning. The story of Bishop Otto Dibelius.* Philadelphia: the Christian Education Press, 1956. 222 pages. \$3.50.

Not an easy book to read, this is written in an awkward, "heavy" style with occasional sentences that are almost unintelligible. Whoever the anonymous author is, he is no craftsman with the English language. This book could have been vastly improved by a revision in the interests of simplicity and clarity. I would have liked the book better, too, if there had emerged from its pages a clear, chronological account of Bishop Dibelius' life. The important facts are there, no doubt, but they are so well padded with commentary and so profusely illustrated with quotations that I lost track of them.

Actually, this volume is more of an anthology and a tribute (lyrical!) than it is a biography. It is too completely uncritical to be a realistic evaluation of a man's life and career. The strength of the book is in the afore-mentioned quotations from Dr. Dibelius' sermons, speeches, and writings. We have here some utterance from nearly every period in his life. The one sample, apparently, of the Bishop's own use of the English language is a speech, recorded in the appendix, which he broadcast from London on the occasion of Karl Barth's 70th birthday in 1956. In both style and content, this is delightful.

LOWELL O. LARSON

*Psychotherapy and Religion.* By Henry Guntrip. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 200 pages. \$3.00.

This book attempts a bridge between psychology and religion. The danger in such engineering is that the psychologist knows nothing fundamental about theology beyond his early Sunday-school lessons, and the theologian knows only last year's psychology. Dr. Guntrip is a psychotherapist in England. For eighteen years he was a Congregational

parish pastor, during the last five years he also practiced therapy. The religion he is interested in is not particularly Christian and can most sympathetically be described by this quotation: "Psychotherapy is evidently a truly religious experience, and religion at its maturest is the fullest attainment of the aims of psychotherapy" (p. 199).

The unanswered question of this book is, Why was *religion* introduced into the title? For it plays no part in the structure or contents of the book, except as an addendum which masquerades as the last chapter. No doubt the answer lies in the fact that the author had to give a lecture at a Congregational theological conference. This provided the reason for a book. But Dr. Guntrip is out for bigger game than interesting preachers in easy techniques of soul-care. He takes this opportunity to present a thorough conceptual framework for present advances in psychoanalytic theory. Unless the reader has a very respectable amount of psychoanalytic literature behind him, therefore, he will flounder pretty often. Most pastors will not get much help from this book in improving or understanding their own pastoral relationships to psychotherapy.

Guntrip proposes to use Fairbairn's tension of the need for good-object relationships instead of bad-object relationships in the unconscious as an adequate replacement for Freud's mechanistic libidinal drive. Freud's heuristic device, it can be recalled, was essentially: the biological organism possesses basic psychic energy. This energy is directed toward the pursuit of pleasure and relief from pain. *Libido*, Freud hypostatizes further, arises out of the *Id*, the deep unconscious mind. Because this energy has no morals (all power is a-moral) it must be corrected or channeled into socially-acceptable forms by the *Ego*. This conscious self, the *Ego*, is assisted by the *Super-ego*, which consists of the authority-figures from the child's life, such as father, teacher, priest, taken into the psyche and made a part of it.

Guntrip would like to believe with Fairbairn that the libido is object-seeking, not pleasure-seeking. Psychological history for an individual consists, then, in the relationships he has made with "good" or "bad" objects. He represses the bad objects (par-

ents, primarily). He never loses them, however. He projects upon any existential social relationship the object-relationship in his private history of which the present reminds him. These good- or bad-objects appear to be reified without even an embarrassed titter from the author.

He goes on to find all men having basic personality types which he calls *schizoid* or *melancholic*, depending on how the individual is solving his unconscious relationships to the bad-objects, these rejecting and anxiety-producing parent figures. Thus, if the individual wants love, and does not get it, he may become angry at himself in order to keep the love-object from hurting him (the melancholic). Or he may, even more primitively, get more and more hungry for love, remaining always unsatisfied, always withdrawing from the desired love-object for fear that it will be devoured by this hunger he has. The author provides no evidence in this discussion for any obligation he should have to Kretschmer's *Medizinische Psychologie* for this dichotomy of all humanity into *schizoid* and *cycloid*, a distinction made more than a generation ago.

It is in the province of a review to ask whether this theory is a true description of the facts. But we should be clear about the effort for theoretical accuracy of what claims to be a better scientific analysis of personality than was available previously. Suppose then we start here: "Science is testable hypotheses concerning the relationship between phenomena." Then the more fruitful the comprehensive theory behind the individual hypotheses, the more likely we are that a true description is being offered of the facts. Likewise, the smaller the pile of stubborn facts which must be left unexplained or uncorrelated alongside the edifice of theory, the more likely that we are approximating truth.

This theory, in contrast to Freud's (which certainly has been fruitful enough to change the character of literature, social welfare, sociology, politics, education, etc.), looks pretty barren from here. It actually presupposes an understanding as to why the parent-object is good or bad. But this is what this larger theory ought to deal with if we are going to the arena with Freud, as Guntrip intends we shall. Anxiety, anger,

love-needs—these are the basic stuff we are supposed to explain in personality. They cannot be used for explanations as to why the objects become good or bad and then produce these other psychic phenomena as by-products. Further, no explanation devolves from this theory as to why the unconscious reports material utterly outside the psychic history of the individual, a bit of disconcerting gravel dredged out of psychotherapeutic experiences upon which Karl Jung has built his whole elaborate temple of Dionysian religion, as is well known.

Other boards and stones left on the sidelines might include: Why do dreams also symbolize good objects? Why dream at all if the objects cause the dream, instead of, as in classic psychoanalysis, the dreams cause the object? And most seriously, Freud at least had an *it*, a *something*, which was doing something. Here we are offered the unconscious, made up of functions of social experience. This is of course typical of Behaviorism and a host of second-rate assumptions in current psychology. But *who* has the relations with the bad- and good-objects? Does this not appear as though Hume's old "bundle of sensations," as the total meaning of the soul, simply came out in a new coat of many colors? Everybody forgets to ask who ties it up into a bundle. As a theory, then, we would want to ask for a great deal more support and self-criticism before this can assume its place as successor to Freud.

GEORGE H. MUEDEKING

*The Meaning of Persons.* By Paul Tournier. Translated by Edwin Hudson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 238 pages. \$3.75.

Here is a book on psychotherapy that is largely free from pedantic terminology and stereotyped categories. The translator must have done an excellent job because the literary style flows freely and the blithe spirit of a truly spontaneous person really bubbles forth. This Swiss psychiatrist is evidently not only a technically competent therapist, well schooled in psychoanalytic and other theories of healing, but is also a devout Christian who sees the implications of his faith for interpersonal relationships. The

dust jacket states, "He is an active member of international meetings held at the Ecumenical Institute on Christian Faith and Medical Practice."

He is concerned that "the dialogue" of communication and other relationships between people be sincere and honest. Too often we do not dare to expose our true selves or persons to each other but offer each other artificial and disguised selves which the author calls "the personage." The personage is not only our formal status in society but too frequently a distortion of the person, a misrepresentation, or an idealized image of what we would like to have people think of us. The French title is really descriptive of his main thesis: *Le Personnage et la Personne*.

Dr. Tournier casts the old body-mind problem in new terms: "For me it is neither the body which controls the mind, nor the mind which controls the body; rather are both at once the expression of an invisible reality of a spiritual order—the person."

The main task of psychotherapy or any deep counseling is to make hypocrisy and pretense less necessary and sincere dialogue and communication more possible. This psychiatrist includes God in the picture and prayer as a natural part of the communion man needs with the Person who created him as well as with the other persons of his daily life. All in all this is a unique book and most stimulating for anyone interested in counseling or pastoral care because it approaches old themes from a fresh and dynamic motivation.

This book is good reading for any who

fear conflicts between psychiatrists and clergymen because it opens many doors that clumsy and uncreative technicians have closed. We need more of this broad perspective where both physicians and pastors realize they are ministering to the whole man under God's providence and loving concern.

DAVID BELGUM

*Resources for Sermon Preparation.* By David A. MacLennan. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 239 pages. \$3.75.

This is a collection of "helps" for preachers, to be distinguished from a book on preaching. Suggested subjects and outlines, "seed thoughts," illustrations, and a sermonette or two by the author are arranged in sections corresponding to seasons of the church year.

Dr. MacLennan is professor of Homiletics and Liturgics at The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. The chapters in this volume are reprinted from a column in *Church Management*. His book is probably a better-than-average work of its type, and many preachers may find it occasionally helpful. It exhibits, however, weaknesses common to this kind of writing. It often seems "labored" and contrived, sometimes overly clever.

In view of the fact that books like *Resources for Preaching* are often done by qualified men of scholarship and talent, perhaps the reason they are so generally unsatisfying is that there is something basically unsatisfactory about the approach. I suspect that it demands the impossible of the writer, as it does to some extent of the reader.

LOWELL O. LARSON